





By 11/15

EPS

ANN / 25 (1)





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2019 with funding from  
Wellcome Library

<https://archive.org/details/s25id13212280>







THE  
ANNUAL REGISTER,  
OR A VIEW OF THE  
HISTORY,  
POLITICS,  
AND  
LITERATURE,  
OF THE YEAR  
1831.



LONDON:

PRINTED FOR BALDWIN AND CRADOCK;

J. G. & F. RIVINGTON;

LONGMAN, REES, ORME, AND CO.; E. JEFFERY AND SON; J. M. RICHARDSON; J. BOOTH; J. BOOKER; J. RODWELL; E. LLOYD; SHERWOOD, GILBERT, AND PIPER; HAMILTON, ADAMS, AND CO.; G. LAWFORD; J. DOWDING; WHITTAKER, TREACHER, AND ARNOT; SIMPKIN AND MARSHALL; T. LAYCOCK; J. MARTIN; S. W. SUSTENANCE; AND RENSHAW AND RUSH.



# CONTENTS

## HISTORY OF EUROPE

### CHAPTER I

STATE of the Reform Question—Reform Bill introduced by Ministers into the House of Commons—Debate of seven nights on the Motion for leave to bring in the Bill—Speech of Lord John Russell—Sir R. H. Inglis—Mr. Twiss—The Opposition of the Bishops—Mr. Hume—Mr. Ward—Mr. Macaulay—Mr. Hunt—Sir Charles Wetherell—The Attorney-General

### CHAPTER II

Continuation of the Debate on the Motion for leave to bring in the Reform Bill—Speech of Mr. Baines—Mr. Hobhouse—Mr. Baring—Lord Palmerston—Sir Robert Peel—Mr. Stanley—The Lord Advocate—Mr. Croker—Mr. Hope—Mr. R. Grant—Mr. O'Connell—Mr. Atwood—Sir James Graham—Bill allowed to be brought in without a Division, and read a First Time

### CHAPTER III

Effects of the Reform Bill on the Public Mind—Conduct of the Reformers—London Declaration—The Press, and Complaint of Breach of Privilege—Debate on the Motion that the Bill be read a second time, and Amendment moved that it be read a second time that day six months—Speeches of Sir R. Vyse—Mr. Sturt—Mr. C. Grant—The Solicitor-General—Sir E. Sugden—Mr. Ward—The second Reading carried by Majority of One—Irish Reform Bill brought in and read a First Time—Statements of Ministers regarding the Number of the House

### CHAPTER IV

Alterations in Reform Bill subsequent to the second Reading—Motion that the House go into Committee—General Estimate moved that the existing number of Members for England and Wales shall not be diminished, which is carried against Ministers by a Majority of Eight—Name and Effect of the Bill—Lord W. Russell gives notice, in the House of Peers, of a Motion for an Address to the King not to Dissolve—in the Commons, a Motion of Adjournment pending the Ordinance Estimates, carried against Ministers—Scene in the Commons on the 22nd of April—in the House of Peers, Lord W. Russell's Motion interrupted by the entrance of the King in Person—Protestation and Dissolution of the King in Person—Printer, T. C. Hansard, Paternoster-row, London.



# CONTENTS.

---

## HISTORY OF EUROPE.

### CHAPTER I.

STATE of the Reform Question—Reform Bill introduced by Ministers into the House of Commons—Debate of seven nights on the Motion for leave to bring in the Bill—Speech of Lord John Russell—Sir R. H. Inglis—Mr. Twiss—The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Hume—Mr. B. Ward—Mr. Macaulay—Mr. Hunt—Sir Charles Wetherell—The Attorney-General . . . . . [1

### CHAPTER II.

Continuation of the Debate on the Motion for leave to bring in the Reform Bill—Speech of Mr. Bankes—Mr. Hobhouse—Mr. Baring—Lord Palmerston—Sir Robert Peel—Mr. Stanley—The Lord Advocate—Mr. Croker—Mr. Hope—Mr. R. Grant—Mr. O'Connell—Mr. Attwood—Sir James Graham—Bill allowed to be brought in without a Division, and read a First Time . . . . . [34

### CHAPTER III.

Effects of the Reform Bill on the Public Mind—Conduct of the Reformers—London Declaration—The Press, and Complaint of Breach of Privilege—Debate on the Motion that the Bill be read a Second Time, and Amendment moved that it be read a Second Time that day six months—Speeches of Sir R. Vyvyan—Mr. Sheil—Mr. C. Grant—The Solicitor-General—Sir E. Sugden—Mr. Ward—The Second Reading carried by a Majority of One—Irish Reform Bill brought in and read a First Time—Statements of Ministers regarding the Numbers of the House . [77

### CHAPTER IV.

Alterations in Reform Bill subsequent to the Second Reading—Motion that the House go into Committee—General Gascoyne moves that the existing number of Members for England and Wales shall not be diminished, which is carried against Ministers by a Majority of Eight—Nature and Effect of the Division—Lord Wharncliffe gives notice, in the House of Peers, of a Motion for an Address to the King not to Dissolve—In the Commons, a Motion of Adjournment, pending the Ordnance Estimates, carried against Ministers—Scene in the Commons on the 22nd of April—In the House of Peers, Lord Wharncliffe's Motion interrupted by the entrance of the King to Prorogue Parliament—Prorogation and Dissolution—Case of Privilege in the House of Lords, connected with the Press . . . . . [103



## CHAPTER V.

The Budget—Proposed changes in Taxes—Opposition to a proposed Tax on Transfers in the Funds—Ministers abandon it—Proposed diminution of Duties on Baltic Timber, and augmentation of those on Canada Timber—Ministers defeated on a Division—Arrangement of the Civil List—Ministers refuse to abide by a Reduction recommended by the Select Committee—Increase of the Army . . . . . [125]

## CHAPTER VI.

General Election—Popular Excitement in Favour of the Bill—Pledges demanded from Candidates—Election Riots—Result of the Election—Opening of the New Parliament—Discussions on the Address—Reform Bill brought in, and read a First Time—Clamour of the Reformers against the limitation of the £10 Franchise—Ministers yield the point—Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill—Second Reading carried by a Majority of 136—Discussion in regard to Appleby—The House determines that it shall not be allowed to bring Evidence of its Population—Debate and Divisions on the Motion for going into Committee—Discussion in Committee on an Amendment that the Enfranchising Clauses should be first considered—Division on the Question whether all Boroughs having fewer than 2,000 Inhabitants should be disfranchised—Motion that the Boroughs proposed to be disfranchised shall be divided into Districts returning Members—Motion that the Population be taken according to the Census of 1831 instead of 1821 . . . [149]

## CHAPTER VII.

Continuation of the Committee on the Reform Bill—Discussion regarding Appleby—The Borough of Downton—The Borough of St. Germain's—The Borough of Saltash—Complaints of the Reformers that argument was allowed upon the Bill—Proposal of Ministers that the Bill should take the lead of all other Business—Proceedings of the Reformers—Motion that the Boroughs in Schedule B should retain both Members—Boroughs of Chippenham—Dorchester—Guildford—Sudbury—Motion that Greenwich be excluded from the new Boroughs—Motion that Stoke upon Trent have two Members—Motion of Lord Milton that the new Boroughs, to which the Bill gave only one Member, should have two—Motion against the Enfranchisement of Gateshead as separate from Newcastle—Motion that a Member be given to Merthyr-Tydvil—Debate on the Clause of the Bill for dividing large Counties—Discussion on the Clause enacting that Freeholders in Boroughs should vote for the County—Amendment moved that tenants at will of land should have a vote for Counties, and carried against Ministers . . . [178]

## CHAPTER VIII.

Continuation of Committee on Reform Bill—Mr. Hunt's Amendment on the £10 Franchise, to the effect of admitting Universal Suffrage—Amendment, that Freeholders in Boroughs shall vote for the Borough, and not for the County—Motion, that the £10 rent shall not be payable more frequently than quarterly—Discussions regarding existing rights of Franchise—Discussions on the Clauses directing the mode of Registration and regulating Elections—Consideration of the Report of the Bill—Motion, that Aldborough be totally Disfranchised—Alterations made on considering the Report—Debate on Motion that the Bill pass—Motion carried by a Majority of 109 . . . [216]



# CONTENTS.

v

## CHAPTER IX.

Reform Bill read a First Time in the House of Lords—Threats of the Reformers against the Peers—Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Lords—Speeches of Lords Grey, Wharncliffe, Winchelsea, Harrowby, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Lyndhurst, &c.—The Bill is thrown out by a Majority of forty-one—Motion carried in the House of Commons that Ministers ought not to resign—Lord Howe dismissed from his office of Queen's Chamberlain, on account of his vote, and disclosures thereupon in the House of Commons—Attacks on the persons and houses of the Peers—Riots at Derby and Nottingham—Correspondence of Ministers with the Political Unions, and discussions thereon in the House of Commons—Financial Statement—Prorogation of Parliament—Riots in Bristol—Formation of a National Political Union in London—Proposed general meeting of the Working Classes—Proclamation against Illegal Associations—Appearance of the Cholera Morbus in the North . . . [252]

## CHAPTER X.

IRELAND.—Lawless state of the Peasantry in Ireland—Distress of the Population—Associations in Dublin for a Repeal of the Union—O'Connell's intended Procession of the Trades prohibited by Proclamation—O'Connell summons his assemblies under a new name, and they are again prohibited by Proclamation—Proposal that O'Connell himself shall be declared to be an association—He renews his meetings in the shape of a Public Breakfast—The Breakfasts are prohibited by Proclamation—New devices of the Agitators to evade the law, followed by another Proclamation—Partial run upon the Banks—O'Connell convokes another meeting, which is dispersed by the Magistrates—O'Connell and his coadjutors apprehended for illegal proceedings—True Bills are found against them—He puts in a demurrer, then withdraws it, and pleads Not Guilty—Attempts to delay his Trial—Withdraws his plea, and pleads Guilty—Discussions in Parliament whether Government had made a compromise with the Agitators—None of the Agitators brought up for Judgment—Declarations against a Repeal of the Union—Discussions in Parliament on the same subject—Continued disturbances in Ireland—Insurrection Act enforced by Proclamation in several Counties, and Special Commissions to try the offenders—Fatal collisions between the Peasantry and the Authorities at Castle Pollard—At Newton-barry—In County Kilkenny . . . [300]

## CHAPTER XI.

FRANCE.—State of Parties—Turbulence of the Students—Riots in Paris against the Clergy—Proceedings against the Bourbonists—Insecurity of the Ministry—Resignation of Ministers, and formation of a New Ministry—Policy of the New Ministry—Riot Act passed—New Electoral Law—Expenditure—Attempt to raise a Loan by Public Subscription—Prorogation of the Chambers—Tumults in Paris—Quarrel between the Ministry and the Heroes of July—Tour of the King in the Provinces—Disorderly state of Paris—Dissolution of the Chambers—General Election—Riots in Paris—Expedition against Portugal—Opening of the Session of the New Chamber—Celebration of the Revolution—Exhibition of Austrian banners in the Chamber of Peers—Small Majority in favour of the Ministerial Candidate for the Presidency of the Chambers—Ministers Resign—They withdraw their Resignations on the Invasion



of Belgium by Holland—Expedition to Belgium—Great Majority in favour of Ministers on the Address—Bill for altering the Institution of the Peerage—Creation of Peers to carry it through the Upper Chamber—Riots in Paris—Complaints against the Bourbonists—Act banishing from France all Relations of the Bourbon Family, or of Napoleon—Serious Disturbances at Lyons . . . . . [329]

## CHAPTER XII.

**HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.**—Candidates for the Belgic Crown—France declares that it will not recognize the Duke of Leuchtenberg—The Duke of Nemours is chosen—Decision of the Five Powers in regard to the Sovereign of Belgium—The Duke of Nemours refuses the Crown—The Belgians elect a Regent—Proceedings of the Conference—Disputes regarding the Scheldt—Warlike spirit of the Belgic Congress—The Conference lays down Bases of Separation—Belgium rejects and protests against them—Wavering Policy of France—Holland accepts of the Bases—Answer of the Conference to the Belgian Protest—The Conference declares the terms accepted by Holland to be “fundamental and irrevocable”—Belgium refuses them, demands War, and calls on Luxemburg to rise against the decision of the Five Powers—Anarchy throughout Belgium, and Riots in the principal Towns—Belgium is allowed till the 1st of June to accept of the Bases, under the pain of all relations between her and the Five Powers being broken off—The Conference endeavours to compass the Election of Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, and promise their good offices with Holland in favour of Belgium, on the latter accepting the Bases—Belgium endeavours to negotiate directly with Holland, under a threat of renewing hostilities—Breach of the Armistice by the Belgians at Antwerp—Letter of Lord Ponsonby, on the part of the Conference, to the Belgian Government—The Congress, without accepting the Bases, elects Prince Leopold King—Holland demands the execution of the fundamental and irrevocable Bases—The Conference again promise to enforce them, and order their Representatives to quit Brussels—Prince Leopold delays accepting the Crown—The Conference recede from the irrevocable Bases, and propose new terms at the expense of Holland—The Belgian Congress accepts them—Holland rejects them, and demands the performance of the existing Agreements—Prince Leopold accepts the Crown, and he is installed at Brussels with the concurrence of the Conference—Holland declares the Armistice at an end, and the Dutch Army enters Belgium—Rout of the Belgians at Hasselt—Their Army, commanded by the King, defeated at Louvain, and Louvain captured—A French Army arrives at Brussels, and the Dutch troops retire—Proceedings of the Conference in reference to the march of the Dutch and French Armies—The French troops are recalled—Opening of the Session of the Belgic Chambers—The Conference frames another new set of Articles, and declares that their acceptance shall be compulsory—Belgium accepts them—Holland rejects them, but offers to negotiate—Negotiation refused—Treaty signed between the Five Powers, and the King of Belgium . . . . . [372]

## CHAPTER XIII.

**GERMANY.**—Insurrections in Hanover, at Osterode, and Gottingen—Accession of Duke William of Brunswick in place of his brother—Public movements in Hesse Cassel and Saxony.—**SWITZERLAND.**—Insurrections and military operations in the Canton of Basle—The insurgents are put down—and again take arms—A federal army occupies the Can-



ton—Insurrection in Schwyz—Insurrection in Neufchatel—Changes in the other Cantons—Proceedings of the Diet.—POLAND.—The Dictator attempts to negotiate—He resigns and a Committee of Government is appointed—Polish Manifesto against Russia—The Throne of Poland declared vacant—Preparations for war—The Russian army approaches Warsaw—Battles in the neighbourhood of Warsaw—The Russians retire—The Poles attack and carry their positions—Defeat of the Poles in Volhynia and Podolia—The Russian army again advances and again retreats—The Poles assume the offensive—Battle of Ostrolenko—The Polish army falls back upon Warsaw—Operations in Volhynia—The Poles defeated in Lithuania—The Russians prepare to cross the Vistula—Dissensions in Warsaw—The Russians establish themselves on the left bank of the Vistula—Insurrections and outrages in Warsaw—The Committee of Government resigns, and a Dictator is appointed—Progress of the Russians—Storming of the fortifications of Warsaw—Warsaw surrenders—Dispersion of the Polish army—Progress of the Cholera Morbus. . . . . [417]

## CHAPTER XIV.

SPAIN.—Insurrection at Cadiz—Defeat of the rebels—Arrests and executions at Madrid—Unsuccessful attempt of General Torijos.—PORTUGAL.—Complaints of the British Government, and demands for satisfaction—A fleet is sent to the Tagus, and satisfaction obtained—Complaints of the French Government—Satisfaction is refused—France makes reprisals on the Portuguese flag—Britain refuses the application of Portugal to interfere—A French fleet dispatched to Lisbon—The demands of the French Admiral refused, till he forces the Tagus—The French carry off the Portuguese fleet—State of Lisbon—Return of Don Pedro from Brazil to Europe—He makes preparations for a descent on Portugal—Unsuccessful Insurrection by part of the garrison of Lisbon—British men of war sent to Lisbon and Oporto—The forces of the Regency of Terceira capture the Island of St. George, and the Island of St. Michael—Defensive preparations of Don Miguel.—ITALY.—Election of a Pope—Plan of general Insurrection—Insurrection at Modena—The Duke leaves it and a provisional Government is established—Insurrection and establishment of a provisional Government at Bologna—It becomes general in the Legations—Insurrection at Parma—Proclamations of the insurgents to the inhabitants of Austrian Lombardy—and of Naples—Differences between France and Austria—The Austrian troops cross the Po against the insurgents, who immediately disperse—The insurrection put down, and the former Government restored in Modena, in Parma, and in the Papal States—New troubles in the Papal Legations—Death of the King of Sardinia.—GREECE.—Unpopularity of the President—Maina and Hydra revolt—The Hydriots take possession of the Greek fleet at Poros—The Russian fleet blockades them, and demands the surrender of the ships—The President attacks Poros by land, and is repulsed—Its inhabitants are removed to Hydra—The Russian Admiral prepares to attack the Greek fleet—Its commander Miaulis blows it up—Proceedings of the Mainotes—Assassination of the President. . . . . [440]

## CHAPTER XV.

UNITED STATES—SOUTH AMERICA.—State of Brazil—Disturbances at Rio Janeiro—The Emperor abdicates in favour of his son.—BUENOS AYRES—Military operations—COLOMBIA—Death of Bolivar—Insurrection in Panama—MEXICO—PERU.—Disturbances at Lima. . . . . [460]



## CHRONICLE . . . 1

## APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

King's Ministers . . . .	196
Members of the House of Com- mons . . . .	197
Sheriffs . . . .	201
Births . . . .	202
Marriages . . . .	204
Promotions . . . .	210
Deaths . . . .	216
Public Income . . . .	262
Public Expenditure . . . .	264
Disposition of Grants . . . .	265
Ways and Means . . . .	272
Public Unfunded Debt . . . .	273
Public Funded Debt . . . .	274
Trade of the United Kingdom	276
Navigation of the United King- dom . . . .	277
Public General Acts . . . .	279, 284
Public Acts of a Local and Per- sonal nature . . . .	280, 286
Stocks . . . .	291
Prices of Corn, Hay, and But- cher's Meat . . . .	292
Bills of Mortality—Bankrupts —and Meteorological Table	293
Table of Number of Houses rated for the Inhabited House- Tax . . . .	294
Ditto, for the Metropolis . . . .	295
Committals, Convictions, &c. <i>ibid.</i>	
State of Savings' Banks and Charitable Societies . . . .	296
University Intelligence . . . .	297

LAW CASES AND NARRA-  
TIVES.

Contempt of Court—Privilege of Parliament . . . .	301
Court of Justiciary, Edin- burgh.—Riot at Dundee . . . .	307
Ditto, Riots at Haddington . . . .	310
Ditto, Rioting at Edinburgh . . . .	311
Ditto, Murder of Alexander Ross . . . .	313
Old Bailey.—Trials of Bishop,	

Williams, and May, Murder, for the purpose of selling the bodies . . . .	316
--	-----

## PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

I. Domestic.—Abstract of the Reform Bill . . . .	336
Instructions and Regulations regarding Cholera, issued under authority of the Privy Council . . . .	357
II. Foreign.—Documents con- nected with the separation of Belgium from Holland . . . .	361
Speech of King Leopold on opening the Belgic Congress	403
Speech of the King of Holland on opening the Sessions of the States General . . . .	405
Manifesto of the Polish Estates	407
Circular of the Polish Govern- ment to Foreign Cabinets . . . .	414

## MANNERS AND CUSTOMS.

Present State of the Peasantry of Livonia . . . .	432
Russian Military Colonies . . . .	433
The Day of a Philadelphian Lady . . . .	435
American Society . . . .	437
American Servants . . . .	438
American Camp Meeting . . . .	440

## ARTS.

The Life-buoy now in use in the Navy . . . .	445
PATENTS . . . .	446

## POETRY.

Parental Love . . . .	453
Evening . . . .	<i>ibid.</i>
Night . . . .	<i>ibid.</i>
Spring Hymn . . . .	454
Naples : — The Song of the Syren . . . .	455
Youth . . . .	456
INDEX.	

THE  
ANNUAL REGISTER,  
FOR THE YEAR  
1831.

---

HISTORY OF EUROPE.

CHAP. I.

*State of the Reform question—Reform Bill introduced by Ministers into the House of Commons—Debate of seven nights on the Motion for leave to bring in the Bill—Speech of Lord John Russell—Sir R. H. Inglis—Mr. Twiss—The Chancellor of the Exchequer—Mr. Hume—Mr. B. Ward—Mr. Macaulay—Mr. Hunt—Sir Charles Wetherell—The Attorney-General.*

THE ministry which succeeded that of the Duke of Wellington, had entered office under express declarations that they would forthwith apply themselves to what was termed the reform of the representation, that is, to strengthen and enlarge the democratic part of the Constitution. To this they were pledged, both by their general principles as a party, and by the opinions to which they had given utterance regarding the political events which had agitated Europe during the preceding year. What might be the extent of the changes which they meant to introduce, how much they would destroy and how much reconstruct; how

VOL. LXXIII.

far they would be satisfied with diffusing the elective franchise over places which had grown up in the course of years, and still remained unrepresented, or how far they would allow themselves to be seduced by the love of making constitutions,—remained unknown; neither was there any thing in the composition of the ministry from which its measures could be predicted. If at its head was Earl Grey, whose opinions were favourable to changes of no moderate kind, it contained Lord Melbourne, Lord Palmerston, and Mr. Grant, the disciples of Mr. Canning, the most inveterate and unyielding foe of changes in the Constitution. The

[B]



fact that they had accepted office under a ministry pledged to change, was sufficient evidence that they were prepared to depart from their former opinions; but it was not to be anticipated that they would readily rush into the opposite extreme. It was clear, too, that the whigs themselves were not all of one mind. Lord Brougham's motion on parliamentary reform had stood, in the House of Commons, for the very day succeeding that on which the Duke of Wellington had retired. His plan, therefore, if not in all its details, yet in its broad principles and general arrangements, must have been ready for presentation; but the long adjournment till the third of February, confessedly on the ground that much time and many inquiries were necessary to settle the intended ministerial constitution of the commons, gave reason to believe that this plan would be very different from that of the Lord Chancellor, which, if his colleagues had approved of it, courted their acceptance.

While the members of the ministry were occupied in framing the new parliamentary constitution, meetings were held in all parts of the country, in counties, in towns, and in parishes, for the purpose of getting up petitions, which were at once to be the result and the support of the declared intentions of the government. Such expressions of opinion are at all times easily obtained; and, in reference to such a topic, they bear on the solution of the question only in so far as they prove the fact of the existence of an unsatisfied desire in masses of the population, in regard to their political condition. Reform, in all the thousand modifications of meaning which were

included under this general term, comprehended an extension of the elective franchise: to extend the franchise was to confer political power; to petition for reform, therefore, was merely the very natural expression of a desire to possess political power—a desire which it is always difficult to control and repress, but the excitement of which, into even its most extravagant expression, is an exploit of absolutely vulgar facility. That thousands of men declare political power to be their right, does not make it a right; that they unanimously demand to be put in possession of it, no more touches the reason of the question—is it fitting and expedient that they should possess it?—than their unanimous demand to be put in possession of the estates of their neighbours, or to be exempted from taxation, would prove that what they sought was useful and proper.

No difficulty, therefore, was found in bringing forth all over the country, loud and violent demands that the democratical part of the constitution should be strengthened and extended; and the task was the more easy, as the reformers were aided by the contagion of foreign example. The revolution of the preceding year in France was the origin of the outcry for reform in Britain. Previous to that event, reform, a standing topic, to some extent or other, in every session of parliament, had excited less attention than usual; even the restless spirit of petitioning had fallen into a slumber; in the public mind there was no agitation. In 1821 there had been nineteen petitions for reform; in 1822 there had been twelve; twenty-nine in 1823; during the following six years there had not



been a single petition, and in the session of 1830, only fourteen. No domestic causes had sprung into operation to produce a sudden and general change in the people, or the populace of Britain; no rights had been infringed; no grievous and wide malversations had been newly detected; in nothing had the government come into violent collision with public opinion. But the populace of Paris rose successfully in arms to resist an open and outrageous attack by the crown upon the rights which the constitution had secured to the country. They rose, not to seize power which they did not possess, but to resist an attempt to deprive the people of the power of which it was already legally in possession. The triumph of popular resistance to tyrannical aggression in France roused the spirit of popular encroachment upon established institutions in Britain. The crown had made no assault on the recognized rights of the people; there had been no attempt to govern by proclamations, to raise money by orders in council, to establish a censorship over the press, or to alter the representative system of the country. But the exhibition of popular power, in full possession, for a time, of the government of one country, excited all the popular propensities of the other; and as the excitement thus produced found no tyrannical attack against acknowledged rights on which it could fix as its object, it sought for itself an object in rights which it did not possess, and found vent in a cry for parliamentary reform.

The men who raised or propagated this cry, might differ as to the means by which the object was to be attained: but the cry itself signified, in the mouths of all of

them, that the power and efficacy of the democratical part of the constitution should be increased. Therefore, if the British constitution was to be preserved, the answer to the question whether reform should be granted, depended entirely on the degree to which the control of the great body of the people, acting by the House of Commons, over the measures of government, should be increased and extended. The efficiency of the democratic branch of the constitution might be so augmented, overwhelming property and education beneath the weight of mere numbers, as to render the government a democracy in every thing but in name; or the change might be so limited, by extending the franchise to places, which, though wealthy and populous, had not yet received members, as to render it nothing more than the introduction of an additional quantity of the mixed representation which already existed. The degrees, by which the power of the popular body might be increased, were infinite; and the question, how far its increase was fitting and safe, or how far necessary to secure the objects of good government, was a question to be decided by sound reason—not by the mere fact that certain bodies of men desired political power. The petitions, however, which were now industriously manufactured in every part of the country, were almost uniformly found wanting in this, the only intelligible question that could arise. Thus one set of petitioners prayed for “the equalization and extension of the right of suffrage,”—but whether they meant such an extension and equalization as would convert the government into a democracy, or



some more modified degree of change, they either did not know, or were afraid to declare. Others announced that "for the sake of every thing that is truly valuable in society, a real, substantial and effectual reform in the representation of the people is become absolutely necessary,"—but what would amount, in the opinion of the petitioners, to a real, substantial, and effectual reform, and whether a reform, meriting, in their eyes, the honour of these epithets, would not be inconsistent with the permanent and useful existence of the other branches of the constitution, was left to conjecture. When the petitioners departed from these unmeaning generalities, the demands which they put forward were, the annihilation of all influence on the part of the aristocracy in returning members to the House of Commons—the shortening the duration of parliaments—the extension and equalization of the elective franchise: but how it was to be extended was left untold; except in those petitions which demanded that the right of suffrage should be universal. A large proportion of these petitions further set forth, that no measure of reform, however radical might be the changes which it would introduce, would prove an effectual remedy, unless it provided that all votes in future should be given by ballot. The evils supposed to have been inflicted on the community by the absence of some full and substantial reform, were found in the existing commercial and manufacturing distress; the frequency of unjust and unnecessary wars; the profligate expenditure of the public money; and the amount of taxation, kept up, it was said, merely to impoverish the

country by squandering its resources on pensioners and placemen. These were assertions in which no sober-minded or well-informed man reposed any confidence. The most popular of them all, the abuse of paying public money to pensioners and placemen, was, at the same time, the most ridiculous. No man could believe that the amount of the pension list, even if every item it contained were unjustifiable, could be felt as a pressure on the country; and the new ministers themselves not only did not diminish it, but refused to accede to a recommendation to reduce the civil list, contained in a report of their own committee. Another feature in some of the petitions was, that they recommended a reform of property as well as of representation, by demanding that the possessions of the church should be seized, and appropriated to what they called the necessities of the state. In many places again, the petitioners, satisfied with announcing the general proposition, that the country was ruined, and could be restored only by reform, left it to his Majesty's ministers to declare what kind and quantity of change would best answer the purpose. The true result to be obtained from generalities which meant nothing, or particular propositions which all rational men disliked, was simply this, that the great mass of the people were desirous to be put in possession of political power, and having come to consider that possession as a matter of abstract right—a thing which does not exist in political institutions—they did not willingly bring their reason to weigh consequences, or when they did, that reason was easily bribed to the belief that their pos-



session of power must be beneficial to the community, and that all resistance to what they deemed and called a right, must be treated as oppression and usurpation.

Besides the usual machinery of petitions, permanent political associations had already begun to be formed in different parts of the country, for the purpose of organizing large numbers of individuals into one body, to act on the mind of the public around them and press upon the government. These self-constituted organs of popular opinion took the name of Political Unions. They had a regular array of officers, and a council which transacted the ordinary business. Their objects were, to push on political changes to any extent, by any means ; to insist on whatever they chose to demand, as a right which could not be refused without a crime ; to repress, by their display of force, any expression, in their neighbourhood, of opinions of an opposite tendency ; and to make even the government, which they pretended to be supporting, feel, by their violence, that they existed in order to dictate, not to obey. They did not even conceal the effects which they would produce by their mere physical power, and used language of abuse and intimidation which had no meaning except upon the idea that they were prepared and resolved to extort by force the possession of that power which, in their hands, was to save the country. The great object of all their deliberations was to excite incurable enmity in the middling and lower classes against those who stood above them in the order of society. The latter were uniformly represented as persons who had robbed the former of their rights and their

comforts, and whose resistance to the intended new order of things must be put down by force, if they were not timeously frightened into submission.

It was in this state of matters that parliament met, pursuant to adjournment, on the 3rd of February. Ministers had hitherto veiled in profound secrecy the plan of Reform which they intended to introduce. All that was known was, that neither the acts nor the language of their partisans had in any degree tended to repress or allay the excited feeling which existed all around them, and than which nothing could be more unfavourable to the calm discussion of so grave a question. All extravagant demagogues styled themselves, and were treated as, the friends of Ministers ; Ministers on the other hand could not venture to cool the attachment of demagogues who guided the voice of the populace. Ministers alone knew the length to which they had resolved to go ; and seemed already to be aware that no expedient was to be neglected which might keep up the flood of excitation, the only tide to which they could trust for floating through their perilous project. On the first day of the meeting of Parliament, earl Grey stated, that, although it had been a work of considerable difficulty, ministers had at last succeeded in framing a measure which would be effective, without exceeding the bounds of a just and well-advised moderation. It had received the unanimous assent of the government, and would be introduced into the House of Commons at as early a period as possible. Although, however, the measure was thus declared, on the 3rd of February to have been al-



ready framed, and sanctioned by the unanimous approbation of all the members of the government, it was not till the 1st of March, that it was introduced into the House of Commons. It was introduced by lord John Russell, to whom, although not a cabinet minister, this duty had been intrusted, in consideration of his lordship having made, on many occasions, many motions for many partial changes in the existing state of the representation.

His lordship declared in the outset that the measure which he was about to propose had been formed in the mind of earl Grey himself: the world believed that the greater portion of the premier's mind, had been found, on this occasion, to reside within the body of his son-in-law, lord Durham. His lordship farther declared, that the object of ministers had been, while they discarded the notion of complying with violent and extravagant demands, to frame a measure with which every reasonable man in the country would be satisfied: that they wished to take their stand between two hostile parties, neither agreeing with the bigotted on one hand, that no Reform was necessary, nor agreeing with the fanaticism of others, that only one particular reform could be wholesome or satisfactory, but taking a firm and steadfast ground between abuses which were to be amended, and convulsions which were to be averted. These were all most excellent general expressions.

His lordship next laid it down as one principle on which he and his colleagues agreed, that the question of *right* was in favour of the reformers; for the ancient constitution of the country declared, that no man should be taxed

for the support of the state who had not consented, by himself or his representative to the imposition of the taxes. The statute *de Tallagio non concedendo* spoke the same language; and, although some historical doubts had been thrown upon it, its legal meaning had never been questioned. It included "all the freemen of the land;" and it provided that each county should send to the Commons two knights, each city two burgesses, and each borough two members. About an 100 places sent representatives, and thirty or forty others occasionally enjoyed the privilege; but it was discontinued or revived as they rose or fell in the scale of wealth, and importance. No doubt, at that early period, the House of Commons did represent the people of England; but, added his lordship, there is likewise no doubt, that the House of Commons, as it presently subsists, does not represent the people of England.

The right being thus in favour of reform, the house would find that the result would be the same, when they looked to what was reasonable; for it would be impossible to keep the constitution of the House as it at present existed. Who had not heard of the fame of this country, that in wealth it was unparalleled, in civilization unrivalled, and in freedom unequalled, in the history of the empires of the world? Now suppose that a foreigner, well acquainted with these facts, were told, that in this most wealthy, most civilized, and most free country, the representatives of the people, the guardians of her liberties, were chosen only every six years, would he not be very curious and very anxious to hear in what way that operation was



performed, by which this great and wise nation selected the members who were to represent them, and upon whom depended their fortunes and their rights? Would not such a foreigner be much astonished if he were taken to a green mound and informed that it sent two members to the British parliament?—if he were shown a stone wall, and told that it also sent two members to the British parliament—or, if he walked into a park, without the vestige of a dwelling, and learned that that too sent two members to the British parliament?—He would, be still more astonished were he to go into the northern part of the country, and were to see flourishing towns, containing immense manufactories and depositories of every sort of merchandize, and be informed that these places sent no representatives to parliament. He would be still more astonished, were he taken to a great and opulent town—Liverpool for instance—and were to observe the manner in which general elections were there conducted. He would see bribery prevail to the greatest extent; he would see men openly paid for their votes; and he would be astonished that a nation, whose representatives were so chosen, should be at all competent to perform the functions of legislation. The people called loudly for reform, saying that whatever good existed in the constitution of this House—whatever confidence was placed in it by the people, was completely gone. Whatever might be thought of particular acts, the confidence of the country in the constitution of the House had long ceased; and so long as towns like Leeds and Manchester elected no representatives, while such places as Gatton and Old Sarum did, it

was impossible to say that the representation was fairly and properly carried on. From these premises his lordship arrived at this conclusion—if the case be one of right, it is in favour of reform—if it be a question of reason it is in favour of reform—if it be a question of expediency, expedience calls loudly for it.

His lordship then stated the plan by which ministers proposed to meet and satisfy the demand for reform which they averred themselves to believe could no longer be resisted. That plan had been so framed as to remove the reasonable complaints of the people, and these complaints again were principally directed, first, against nomination by individuals; secondly, elections by close corporations; thirdly, the expenses of elections. In so far as concerned the first two grounds of complaint, the plan of ministers consisted first of disfranchisement, in order to get rid of places which had hitherto sent members to parliament: secondly, of enfranchisement, in order to enable places which had hitherto been unrepresented, to elect members: thirdly, of an extension of the franchise, in order to increase the number of electors in those places which were to be allowed to retain in whole, or in part, their existing privilege of sending members to the House of Commons.

The part of the plan, which related to disfranchisement, proceeded on a very plain rule, viz. to disfranchise all boroughs whose population did not exceed a certain number. Lord John Russell allowed it would be an extremely difficult task to ascertain the wealth, trade, extent, and population of a given number of places. We have therefore been governed, said he, by what is a



public record—the population return of 1821, and we propose that every borough which at that date contained fewer than 2,000 inhabitants, shall be deprived entirely of the privilege of sending members to parliament. This would utterly disfranchise sixty boroughs, and get rid of 119 members.\* This, he was perfectly aware, was a bold and decided

\* The following were the Boroughs thus to be disfranchised, and their population according to the census of 1821. They formed Schedule A of the bill:—

	Population.
Aldborough (York) ..	484
Aldeburgh (Suffolk) ..	1,212
Appleby .. ..	824
Bedwin .. ..	1,928
Beeralston .. ..	—
Bishop's Castle .. ..	1,616
Bletchingley .. ..	1,187
Boroughbridge .. ..	860
Bossiney .. ..	877
Brackley .. ..	1,851
Bramber .. ..	98
Buckingham .. ..	1,495
Callington .. ..	1,321
Camelford .. ..	1,256
Castle Rising .. ..	343
Corfe Castle .. ..	1,465
Dunwich .. ..	200
Eye .. ..	1,882
Fowey .. ..	1,455
Gatton .. ..	135
Haslemere .. ..	887
Hedon .. ..	902
Heytesbury .. ..	1,329
Higham Ferrers .. ..	877
Hindon .. ..	830
Ilchester .. ..	802
Looe, East .. ..	770
Looe, West .. ..	539
Lostwithiel .. ..	933
Ludgershall .. ..	477
Malmesbury .. ..	1,322
Midhurst .. ..	1,335
Milborne .. ..	1,440
Minehead .. ..	1,239
Newport (Cornwall) ..	977
Newton (Lancashire) ..	1,643
Newton (Isle of Wight) ..	767
Okehampton .. ..	1,907
Orford .. ..	1,119
Petersfield .. ..	1,446
Plympton .. ..	762

measure; he knew that, on ordinary occasions, no interest, however trifling, should be touched. But this was no ordinary occasion; and the interests to be touched were not private interests, but public trusts. The House had done the very same thing, when, under the former ministry, it disfranchised the forty-shilling freeholders of Ireland. All the boroughs to be thus totally disfranchised were nomination boroughs, in the gift of individual patrons, and the interest of the latter certainly was not deserving of more consideration than had been the franchise of the Irish peasant. “Shall we say that the principle of allowing no partial interests to stand in the way of the public good is to be maintained, when the poor peasantry of Ireland are concerned, but that when it touches the great and wealthy, we are not to venture to treat the question as the public interest demands? Shall we at once deprive the freeholder of Ireland of that right which he merely exercised as the constitution gave it to him, and shall we be afraid to touch the right of the noble proprietor of Gatton, who returns

	Population.
Queenborough .. ..	881
Reigate .. ..	1,328
Romney .. ..	962
St. Mawes .. ..	1,648
St. Michael (Cornwall) ..	1,893
Saltash .. ..	1,548
Old Sarum .. ..	—
Seaford .. ..	1,047
Steyning .. ..	1,324
Stockbridge .. ..	715
Tregony .. ..	1,035
Wareham .. ..	1,931
Wendover .. ..	1,602
Weobley .. ..	739
Whitchurch .. ..	1,434
Winchelsea .. ..	817
Woodstock .. ..	1,455
Wootton Bassett .. ..	1,701
Yarmouth (Isle of Wight)	564

two members to parliament, although he derived no such power from the constitution? Shall we say that a strictly constitutional, a strictly legal right shall be abolished, because the convenience, the necessity of the country, demands it—and that a right which is mere usurpation, with no sanction of law, and supported only by usage, shall be respected and left untouched, though the public interest requires, and the public voice demands its abolition! Shall we make this glaring distinction between rich and poor, high and low, disfranchise the peasant, and prop the falling fortunes of the peer!”

But disfranchisement was not to stop here. There were boroughs which should be blotted out altogether. There were others which, although more flourishing in point of population, were too low to have any good title to retain their present privilege of sending two members to the House of Commons. It was, therefore, farther proposed, that all boroughs, whose population, according to the census of 1821, though it exceeded 2,000, was under 4,000, should in future send only two members instead of one. The number of these boroughs was forty-seven,\*

\* Population of the 47 Boroughs, in each of which there was to be a reduction of one Member :—

	Population.
Amersham .. ..	2,612
Arundel .. ..	2,511
Ashburton .. ..	3,403
Bewdley .. ..	3,725
Bodmin .. ..	2,902
Bridport .. ..	3,742
Chippenham .. ..	3,201
Clitheroe .. ..	3,213
Cockermouth .. ..	3,790
Dorchester .. ..	2,743
Downton .. ..	3,114
Droitwich .. ..	2,176

and thus forty-seven members more were disposed of. Weymouth likewise, which had hitherto sent four members was, in future, to send only two.

This process of disfranchisement, proceeding on the simple fact of numbers, and necessarily utterly arbitrary in its very principles, having deprived the House of Commons of 168 members, then began the work of enfranchisement, by giving members to places which had hitherto been unrepresented, and giving more members to other places which had always enjoyed them. In the first place it was proposed that each of seven considerable towns should send two members, and twenty others, one

	Population.
Evesham .. ..	3,487
Grimsby .. ..	3,064
Grinstead .. ..	3,153
Guildford .. ..	3,161
Helston .. ..	2,671
Honiton .. ..	3,296
Huntingdon .. ..	2,806
Hythe .. ..	2,181
Launceston .. ..	2,183
Leominster .. ..	3,651
Liskeard .. ..	2,423
Lyme Regis .. ..	2,269
Lymington .. ..	3,164
Maldon .. ..	3,198
Marlborough .. ..	3,038
Marlow .. ..	2,532
Morpeth .. ..	3,415
Northallerton .. ..	2,626
Penryn .. ..	2,933
Richmond .. ..	3,546
Rye .. ..	3,599
St. Germain's .. ..	2,404
St. Ives .. ..	3,526
Sandwich .. ..	2,912
Sudbury .. ..	3,950
Shaftesbury .. ..	2,993
Tamworth .. ..	3,574
Thetford .. ..	2,922
Thirsk .. ..	2,533
Totness .. ..	3,128
Truro .. ..	2,712
Wallingford .. ..	2,093
Westbury .. ..	2,117
Wilton .. ..	2,058
Wycombe .. ..	2,864



member each.\* This restored thirty-four members. Next were selected twenty-seven of the largest counties,† including Yorkshire, each of which was, in future, to return four members instead of two, with this exception that Yorkshire, already possessing four, was now to return an additional member for each riding. The representation of London likewise was to be more than doubled. The Tower Hamlets, containing a population of 28,000 inhabitants, were to return two members; the district of Holborn (218,000) two members; Finsbury and its district (162,000) two members;

Lambeth, and the places beyond the river, (128,000) two members; and the parish of Marylebone, two members.

The most important part of the ministerial new constitution still remained behind. The cities, boroughs, and counties which were to send members, and the number of members to be elected, being thus ascertained, the existing right of franchise in all of them was to be altered, and a new franchise introduced, extending equally to those which remained untouched, with the declared purpose of increasing the number of electors, and having but one uniform right

\* Population of the proposed new Boroughs:

	Population in 1821.	No. of Houses of 10 <i>l</i> . Rent and upwards.
<i>To send two Members.</i>		
Manchester and Salford .. .. .	133,788	4,288
Birmingham and Aston .. .. .	104,605	4,561
Leeds .. .. .	86,746	2,492
Greenwich, Deptford, and Woolwich .. .. .	56,582	4,177
Wolverhampton, Bilston, and Sedgely .. .. .	66,036	1,052
Sheffield .. .. .	62,105	1,556
Sunderland and the Wearmouths .. .. .	33,911	1,153
<i>To send one Member.</i>		
Isle of Wight .. .. .	31,616	
Brighton .. .. .	24,429	2,763
Blackburn .. .. .	21,940	410
Macclesfield .. .. .	17,745	559
South Shields and Westoe .. .. .	14,000	
Warrington .. .. .	10,000	494
Huddersfield .. .. .	20,000	427
Halifax .. .. .	12,628	461
Gateshead .. .. .	11,767	
Whitehaven, Workington, and Harrington .. .. .	16,000	468
Kendal .. .. .	8,000	
Bolton .. .. .	22,037	766
Stockport .. .. .	10,100	546
Dudley .. .. .	18,211	437
Tynemouth and North Shields .. .. .	11,000	
Cheltenham .. .. .	13,396	1,939
Bradford .. .. .	12,411	444
Frome .. .. .	12,411	256
Wakefield .. .. .	10,764	657
Kidderminster .. .. .	10,709	262

*Note*:—Most of the foregoing enumerated towns had increased from one-fourth to one-half, in population, since 1821.

of election throughout the empire. That right was to be as follows : the elective franchise was to be extended to all persons paying a rent of 10*l.* per annum, whether they occupied the premises or not. Existing resident electors were not to be deprived of their right, during their life-time, but no non-resident elector was to be allowed to retain his franchise. Copyholders whose property was of the yearly value of 10*l.*, and all householders to an equal amount, were to be electors for counties. All holders of leases for twenty-one years, which had not been renewed within two years, were to have the privilege of voting in towns ; and all leaseholders for twenty years, of property worth 50*l.* per annum,

were to vote for counties. In the towns to be named to send members to parliament, the property which entitled a man to vote for the town, was not likewise to entitle him to vote for the county ; so that where the towns had representatives chosen by themselves, they would not interfere with the county representatives. and the two classes of voters would be kept as distinct as possible. No alteration was to be made in regard to the forty-shilling freeholders.

The new constituency being thus formed, the remaining part of the ministerial plan regarded the actual election. All electors were to be registered. The churchwardens and overseers of each parish were to make a return, at

† Population of the Counties which are to send two additional Members each :

Counties.	Population.	No. of Acres.	No. of Houses of 10 <i>l.</i> Rent and upwards.
Cheshire .. .. .	270,093	673,230	4,784
Cornwall .. .. .	257,447	945,920	2,852
Cumberland .. .. .	156,124	958,680	2,400
Derbyshire .. .. .	213,333	656,640	2,287
Devonshire .. .. .	439,040	1,650,560	12,397
Durham .. .. .	207,473	679,040	4,269
Essex .. .. .	289,424	981,480	6,264
Gloucestershire .. .. .	335,843	803,840	9,080
Hampshire .. .. .	283,298	1,812,000	5,844
Kent .. .. .	124,014	983,630	16,129
Lancashire .. .. .	1,052,859	1,171,846	28,406
Leicestershire .. .. .	174,571	514,560	3,357
Lincolnshire .. .. .	283,058	1,756,720	4,026
Norfolk .. .. .	344,348	1,338,880	5,333
Northumberland .. .. .	198,965	1,197,440	6,140
Northamptonshire .. .. .	162,483	650,680	2,237
Nottinghamshire .. .. .	186,873	535,680	3,597
Shropshire .. .. .	204,153	858,240	3,403
Somersetshire .. .. .	355,314	1,050,830	16,569
Staffordshire .. .. .	341,040	734,720	6,116
Suffolk .. .. .	270,542	967,680	3,585
Surrey .. .. .	398,658	485,120	33,865
Sussex .. .. .	233,019	936,320	6,823
Warwickshire .. .. .	274,392	577,280	9,372
Wiltshire .. .. .	222,157	882,560	3,622
Worcestershire .. .. .	184,424	466,560	4,872
Yorkshire .. .. .	1,173,187	3,815,040	20,190



a certain period of every year, of all persons occupying houses of 10*l.* a year. An officer still to be appointed was to hear and decide upon all objections to the return so made. The return itself was then to be made public every year on the 1st of December; and every person whose name appeared in it was to be entitled to vote, without being asked any other question than what was necessary to ascertain his identity. In counties, the list was to be affixed to the doors of every parish church; in all cases of dispute, a barrister was to be appointed by the Judge of Assize to examine into the question, whose judgment should be final; and the list, signed by such barrister, was to be sufficient evidence of the party applying being entitled to vote. Lastly, in order to diminish the expense of elections, the duration of the poll was to be diminished, and the poll was to be taken simultaneously in different places. In towns, the poll was to be limited to two days, or, if necessary, to four. In counties, the poll was to be taken simultaneously in different hundreds, and even at different places in the same hundred. In this way it was expected, that a county might be polled in one day; but if any dispute should arise regarding votes, power was to be given to adjourn the decision till next day. The arrangements were to be such as that no voter should have more than fifteen miles to travel; and the counties, which were to receive additional members, were to be divided into two districts. These arrangements were to be made by a committee of the privy council, named by his majesty; and whenever the number of 10*l.* voters in any boroughs, retaining its franchise, should be

below 300, the same committee was to have power to bring up the number to that point by including the adjoining parishes and chapelries. His lordship admitted that these were vast and extensive powers; but ministers had felt, that the only guarantee, which could be proposed for the due performance of the important duty that would devolve on these commissioners, must be sought for in the known respectability and integrity of the persons to whom it should be confided.

This was the general outline of the reform bill, in so far as England was concerned. In Wales the only alteration, besides introducing there the same uniform franchise about to be created in England, was to consist in adding to the towns in Wales which already sent members to parliament the neighbouring unrepresented towns; for instance, Holyhead to Beaumaris; Bangor to Carnarvon; Wrexham to Denbigh; Holywell and Mold to Flint; Llandaff and Merthyr Tydvil to Cardiff; Welchpool, Llanvilling, and three other places which returned members of parliament formerly, but which had been disfranchised by a decision of the House of Commons, to Montgomery; St. David's, Fishguard, and Newport to Haverfordwest; Milford to Pembroke; Presteign to Radnor. A new district of boroughs was to be erected, consisting of Swansea, Cowbridge, Laugharn and three other places, which should have the privilege of returning one member to parliament—the only additional member which it was proposed to add to the representation of Wales.

His lordship next gave a general outline of the changes to be introduced into the representation of



Scotland and Ireland. In the former, the existing county franchise, which depended, not on the possession of land, but on a mere feudal right of superiority over lands belonging to others, was to be annihilated; the election of members for boroughs was to be taken from the town-councils, and vested in the citizens at large; and both in counties and in boroughs, the new English franchise was to be introduced. Every resident owner of lands or houses worth 10*l.* yearly, and every tenant, under a written lease for nineteen years or upwards, paying 50*l.* a year, was to have a vote in county elections. In towns the franchise was to attach to the occupancy of a dwelling-house rented at 10*l.* per annum. To some of the larger towns, which hitherto had elected only in conjunction with others, as Glasgow and Aberdeen, or which, not being royal boroughs, had enjoyed no share in the representation, as Paisley and Greenock, separate or new members were conferred, while the Fife district of Burghs was annihilated, and thrown into the county, and some counties were conjoined. The detail of these arrangements belongs more properly to the history of the Scottish bill: the result of them was, that Scotland was to have fifty members instead of forty-five. In Ireland the principal alterations were to be, the introduction of the 10*l.* qualification, and that, in towns, the franchise should be taken out of the hands of the corporations, and given to all qualified resident citizens. Belfast was to return one member, and Limerick, and Waterford two each, thus making an addition of three members to the representation of Ireland.

The general result of the whole measure, his lordship said, would be to create a new constituency of about 500,000 persons. The increase for the towns already represented would be about 110,000; for the new towns, 50,000; for London 95,000; for Scotland 60,000; and for Ireland, perhaps, 40,000. In counties 100,000, at least, would be entitled to vote under this bill, who never had the advantage of voting before; and, upon the whole, the constituency of the Commons' House of Parliament would certainly be increased by half a million of persons, and half a million of persons, be it observed, connected with the property of the country, persons having themselves a valuable stake in the country, and upon whom it would depend in any future struggle which this country might have to sustain, to support parliament, and to support the throne in carrying that struggle to a successful termination. The probability of the possession of this franchise would be an inducement to good conduct. When a man found, that by being rated to a certain rent, and by paying rates, he became entitled to a vote in the election of a member of that House, it would be an inducement to him to be careful, frugal, and punctual in his dealings—to preserve his character amongst his neighbours, and the place which he might hold in society. To add this large constituency provided for the political and moral improvement of the people.

It was true that the necessary result of the arrangements which he had detailed was to diminish the total number of members in the House, but that was not a re-



sult which ministers considered as a disadvantage. The present number of members was 658. Of these 168 were to be struck out by disfranchisement, while there would be added, thirty-four for English towns and fifty-five for counties, eight for London, one for Wales, five for Scotland, three for Ireland, in all 106, leaving an absolute diminution of sixty-two, which diminution was inflicted exclusively upon England. Lord John Russell, however, stated the opinion of ministers to be, that this reduction in the number of members would only enable the House to transact the public business more effectually and conveniently.

This being what the new bill intended to do, his lordship adverted to two charges which might be brought against it on account of what it did not do. In the first place it contained no provision for shortening the duration of parliaments. That question had been anxiously considered by ministers, and they had thought it better to leave it entire as a separate question, than to bring it in at the end of a bill which affected the franchise, and other matters totally separate from that question, without saying what was the opinion of ministers upon that question—a question of itself of the utmost importance, and deserving the utmost consideration. It was thought better to present the large measure of reform by itself, and leave the other measure as to the duration of parliaments, either to be brought in by some other member, or to be brought in at a future time by ministers for future consideration. “For my own part, I can only say that though I think it most desirable that constituents should have a

proper control over their representatives, I yet think that it would be inexpedient to make the duration of parliaments so short that members of this house should be in a state of perpetual canvass with the opinions of their constituents, and therefore unable to advise, deliberate, and decide upon any great question which might be brought before them with that freedom which should prevail in the legislature of a great empire, with that confidence which a generous people of a great country ought to grant, when that question is brought forward. The government has no measure of the kind to propose, satisfied, that if they can provide for the constituents the means of electing their own representatives, it would be better not to narrow that question by another which has its own doubts, difficulties, and obstacles to contend with.” The other objection would be, that the proposed bill made no provision for voting by ballot, an expedient which of late had obtained many advocates, and much general support. It no doubt had much to recommend it; but he hoped the House would pause before venturing on its adoption. While, on the one hand, it favoured the conscientious voter, it furnished, on the other, a cover to fraud and crime; it exposed a man to the influence of bad passions; it prevented bad influence over the good, but it likewise prevented good influence over the bad. He also thought it very doubtful whether the people of this country, who had always been accustomed to vote openly, and to state their opinions in the face of day, would ever resort to concealment in the exercise of a most important



privilege. At all events he thought it doubtful whether there ought to be in the community any class of persons wholly irresponsible, and that the ballot did create an irresponsible power, no man could doubt. He did not think it would counteract the influence of different classes of society, the influence of the crown, or the influence of the aristocracy; but even if it did, he would not like to see irresponsible power confided to the hands of any one man, or of any body of men. The formal motion with which his lordship concluded was, for leave to bring in a bill to amend the Representation of the people in England and Wales.

This motion introduced a debate which lasted for seven nights, having begun on Tuesday the 1st of March, and terminated on Wednesday the 9th. In the course of it between seventy and eighty members delivered their opinions. The debate would, of itself, form a volume; but, as it terminated without a division, and as the subsequent fate of the bill occasioned the renewal of the whole discussion, we shall confine ourselves to such an outline as may give some idea of the sentiments called forth by this the first announcement of a new paper Constitution for the United Kingdom.

Sir Robert H. Inglis, member for the University of Oxford, who followed Lord John Russell, admitted that there was excitement and expectation among the people, but neither to the extent which his lordship seemed to suppose, nor to any extent greater than at former periods, when the firmness of the government, opposing instead of fomenting, had been able to repress it, and the country had seen it pass away. The present excitation had

arisen from the examples of France and Belgium. It was all to be found in the three days of Paris, and the events which had followed those three days. When there was any excitement of insurrection in other countries, it had been found to be an epidemic disease; as such, it was brought to this country also; and simultaneous popular tumults were produced. It had been so in 1793, and the French legislators of that day reckoned upon the efficacy of the contagion. As to the measure itself, he denied that it was in any one point, what ministers wished it to be considered, viz., a restoration of the Constitution to its pristine purity, which had been obscured and polluted by successive accumulations of abuses. The very foundation of it, that representation should depend merely on population and taxation, had at no time been a principle of the English constitution. Our sovereigns first called parliaments together, because they wanted men and money, and their appeal was made to the *liberi homines*. The next thing that took place was the calling on the "communities" to assist at these Parliaments; but in this case each community had but one vote; so that even if two members were returned, they had but one vote between them. At that time the county of Cornwall had but eight members. If it could be shown that places were called on to return members which were neither parishes nor market towns, it would be admitted that those places could not be very considerable. Now, there were Haslemere, West Looe, and others, which had never been one or the other, and yet they had been called on to send representatives to Parliament. How could it be con-



tended that population or taxation was the basis on which the principle of representation had been grounded, when not only small towns had been called on to send representatives, but large towns had been left unrepresented? He defied the noble Lord to show in the former precedents of England, a trace of what he had that night laid down—that any town or borough had been called into parliamentary existence because it was large and populous, or excluded from it, because it was small. Old Sarum, had always been the great stumbling block with those who pursued the same line of argument. In one and the same year—the 23rd of Edward I.—a writ had been issued to both Old and New Sarum, and in neither case had it been conferred with reference to population or taxation. On the contrary, it had been given, in the first instance, to oblige some Earl of Salisbury, by putting his friends in the house. And in an account of the borough it was stated that it had lately been purchased by Mr. Pitt, the possessor of the celebrated diamond of that name, who had thus obtained an hereditary seat in the House of Commons, as much as the Earl of Arundel possessed one in the House of Peers by being the owner of Arundel Castle. How, then, was it to be said, that according to the constitution of the country, noblemen were not to be represented and their interests regarded in that house? The cause of the creation of many boroughs was obscure; but, on the other hand, the origin of some was as clear and as well ascertained as possible. It was known that two writs to return members had been issued by Elizabeth at the desire of one of her favourites, Sir Christopher

Hatton; and Newport, in the Isle of Wight, had received its franchise to please Sir G. Carew. This was the history of many of the small boroughs; and, in fact, all the Cornish boroughs had sprung up in that manner. Fifteen Cornish boroughs had at one time received the right of representation, some of which were only small villages, and none of them entitled to rank as considerable among the towns of England. It was in vain after this to talk of the purity of representation in former times: nay, many of the towns, to which it was now proposed to give members, were considerable places at the period when the right of representation was given to other places, and yet they had been omitted. Halifax, three hundred years ago, was known to contain a population of 8,400; Wakefield was a very considerable town at the same time; Manchester, according to tradition, had not less than 5,400 inhabitants for nearly two centuries before 1580, and, at all events it was certain, that, at the latter period, it possessed that amount of population. Since the dates at which Halifax and Manchester possessed that population, fifty-one boroughs, in the former case, and fourteen in the latter, had received writs to send members to parliament, while these two places, had been overlooked. He must confess he did not know how much Manchester had lost by not having, every five or six years, such election scenes as had lately taken place at Liverpool. Both places enjoyed a high degree of prosperity; Liverpool was prosperous with two representatives; Manchester was prosperous without any; and he had never heard, that any of the commercial interests of the latter



had suffered from the want of having advocates in that house who were able and willing to maintain its rights.

Or was this pretended renovation of the constitution to be found in restoring the Commons house to some former independence of the crown which it had lost by the lapse of time? It was easy to show that it had been at all times much more dependent upon the crown and the aristocracy than at present. Was the influence exercised over the house now greater than in the reign of James II.? Would the house now submit to be treated as it would have been treated by Henry VIII.? What was the state of things when the Queen's Majesty directed the sheriffs to return to parliament such men only as were of a particular faith in matters of religion, and of known compliance in matters of politics? In the reign of Edward VI., the sheriffs were directed to select only such members as had been previously recommended by the privy council. Or would they refer to the reign of Henry IV., or the time of Richard II., when a member of parliament was threatened to be executed for merely making a motion on the civil list? Time was, when the Duchess of Norfolk determined not only who should sit for the county of Norfolk, but likewise who should represent Maldon; when Lord Essex could return his kinsman for the county of Stafford, and his servant for the borough of Tamworth. What period, in short, would ministers select as the period of that greater independence than now existed, to which their new constitution was to restore the House of Commons?

The influence exercised by means  
VOL. LXXIII.

of small boroughs, while it was not new, had to the people been any thing but prejudicial. Had it not been for these boroughs, many of those who had been the boast of the country, and the chief ornaments of that house, would never have appeared within its walls. The first borough for which Lord Chatham sat, had been Old Sarum. Mr. Pitt had sat for Appleby: Mr. Fox had come in for a close borough, and, when rejected by a populous place, had again sought refuge in a close borough. Mr. Burke had first sat for Wendover, and, when his talents had been made known, was transferred in his glory to Bristol. Mr. Canning, too, had fixed his fame as a member for Wendover, before he was called for and accepted at Liverpool. It was only thus that young men, not connected with large towns by birth or residence, could ever hope to enter that house, unless they were cursed with that talent of mob oratory, which was used for the purpose of inflaming the lowest and most debasing passions of the people.

In truth, the whole essence of the scheme was, not reform, in any common and sensible meaning of the word—it was revolution. It forgot the immense power which public opinion had been gaining by the press; it forgot that the people were daily becoming more intelligent, and the sympathy between them and their representatives greater, and that all public men were infinitely more under the control of public opinion than at any former period. He believed that in the history of civilised man, there was not to be found any system of representation so completely popular as that now proposed, co-existing with a free

[C]



press on the one hand, and a monarchy, on the other ;—there was no instance upon record of a free press being placed in juxtaposition with a monarchy and a system of representation such as that which the noble Lord had just explained. Before ten years passed away, all the institutions of the country would sink under the effects of the present measure. An attempt at such an experiment as this had been made by the National Assembly in France. Something of the sort had been attempted in Switzerland also, and a similar trial was now being made in France. In France it was too obvious to escape observation, that the attempt to produce a purely popular representation had interrupted that country in the fairest course of liberty, arts, domestic trade, and foreign commerce, to which she had ever attained : and he entertained not the slightest doubt that were the calamity proposed by the noble lord to be inflicted on this land, a similar result would ensue. When the noble Lord, from whose government the present measure proceeded, forty years ago made a proposition in that house for a much more moderate reform, he did not conceal that that very moderate reform involved a fundamental change in the government of the country. What, then, was he not bound to admit with respect to a reform, which went, at a blow, to sweep away one-third of the House of Commons? Were it agreed to, the House of Lords, before ten years, would have but a nominal existence. If the representation of the people was complete and perfect in all parts, nothing could withstand its power and authority. An unreformed House of Lords would not for a moment be toler-

ated by a reformed House of Commons. Mr. Canning more than once had expressed his full conviction that the House of Lords could not continue as at present constituted, if the measure of reform were once carried with reference to the House of Commons; and yet the ministry, which proposed the present measure, contained the men who had been called, and had held themselves out as being Mr. Canning's chosen disciples and peculiar friends.

Mr. Horace Twiss, too, maintained, that the proposed measure went to nothing less than to remove from the House of Commons every alloy of monarchical or aristocratical principle, and convert it into a pure and resistless democracy, which it never had been, and which, consistently with the British constitution, it never ought to be. The most radical speculator that ever existed could scarcely have expected to see the ministers of the crown destroying all the proportions of the legislature—removing all the landmarks of the constitution—calling on the house to sweep away, he would not say the charters of corporations, but all the charters of the realm itself. They had, to be sure, one precedent for their conduct—that of James II.; who by the assistance of unprincipled judges, had destroyed the charters of the boroughs. But this grossly illegal and unconstitutional conduct cost him his throne ;—and what was done at the revolution? Those who effected it again placed the boroughs and corporations on their proper footing; and the declaration sent out by King William, even before his landing in this country, after reprobating the illegal acts of James, declared, “that all the boroughs of



England shall return again to their ancient prescriptions and charters;" — and the convention parliament which, at the Revolution, settled the country, never dreamed, that part of their labours, as restorers of its liberties, ought to consist in destroying charters, and remodelling the representative system. Yet the first parliament of William IV. was now to declare, that the first parliament of William III., instead of re-establishing our free constitution, had ratified its destruction.

The new constitution rested on some supposed necessity for increasing the power of the people; but the true danger to be dreaded in our mixed government arose from the influence of the people, not from any influence of the Crown, or of the aristocracy. Neither would this increase of the power of the people be effected in a beneficial manner. There were a variety of interests connected with the country which required to be represented, and were now represented by means of the boroughs that were to be disfranchised—and the representation of those interests would be annihilated. Neither would the new constituency be one which this country required. He had no objection to any increase of the representation of great trading interests, or of those interests which might be considered necessary to support the executive in times of difficulty or danger, but he could not see the policy of calling to the aid of the country, in such times, the wisdom of householders paying 10*l.* of rent. The measure would let in no great interests: it would promote the influence of shopkeepers and country attornies;

the leader of the country club would now be the important man in his district, and these interests, however respectable in their way, were not the interests which required additional representation. They were interests which would be represented, under the proposed change, by those shallow, but dogged politicians, with whom relief from taxation was every thing, and public credit and national faith were nothing—who looked upon rent and tithe as useless incumbrances. And, when half the constitution had thus been surrendered, would the violent reformers be satisfied? They themselves had avowed that they would not; and that, having obtained so much, they would, at a convenient time, demand more. This measure might create a sensation, and excite intrigue, in some parts of the country, to take advantage of the new power which it would create; but, for the promotion of our great domestic or foreign interests, it would do nothing, or worse than nothing. If it could be shewn that it would relieve the distress which existed, or that its refusal would aggravate the evils of the country, the argument might be listened to. But ministers themselves knew well, that no change in the constitution would afford them the means of retrenching the expenditure of the country to any considerable extent; their own financial measures must have convinced every one that such relief was hopeless. Earl Grey himself had said, in 1819, "that he did not believe that reform would make the country less inclined to war, which was the chief cause of our burdens. A fondness for war was not the fault



of an oligarchical, but of a popular government." Another authority on the same point was, the conduct of the people of France, who planted the tri-coloured flag in the summer of 1830, and were waving it for war in the spring of 1831. If this were the true state of the case, he trusted that hon. members would not be induced, by the excited and irritated state of the public mind, to yield their own well-considered opinions with respect to a matter of so much importance. He did not agree with the noble lord in thinking, that the danger which he had so obscurely glanced at, was so near as it had been pictured. The reformers, who menaced revolution if reform should be refused, would hardly think the proposed measure good enough to run a risk for it. It was, indeed, nothing but a mere evasion of their claims. But there was a better security than their moderation for the preservation of order. The widely-spread industry of the country, the stored-up savings even of the lower orders, the whole dividends even of the public stocks, were solid grounds for confidence in the security of the institutions of the country. By the special blessing of Providence, the burdens of the country formed some sort of security for the welfare of the country. The superincumbent weight, while it pressed, gave stability. There would be no revolution to fear, nor any permanent dissatisfaction to dread. But, if surrendering the free privileges of the legislature, we blindly obeyed the will of the people instead of consulting their welfare—if we decided on this great question, not according to experience and wisdom, but led away by

the cry of the day—then we should let in danger—then we should let in revolution, of which the noble lord had spoken, by teaching the people that their will would alone direct the course of the legislature.

Lord Althorp, the chancellor of the Exchequer, maintained, on the other hand, that there was no symptom or appearance of agitation in the country; but there was wide-spread dissatisfaction with the state of the representation, and a loudly-expressed desire that it should be reformed. These opinions were universal among the great body of the middling classes; and, if the middling classes in this or any other country were hostile to the form of government under which they lived, that government would never be safe, whatever the state of the representation might be. These classes possessed a degree of intelligence which fully qualified them to return members, whose honesty and ability would be useful to the country. They prized the present government, a government by King, Lords, and Commons—but not with a House of Commons constituted partly by nomination, and partly by the purchase of seats. They desired, and he himself was one of those popular theorists who thought them right in desiring, that the popular branch of the legislature should be a real and genuine representation of the people. Government, therefore, had pledged themselves to bring forward a full and efficient reform, and that pledge they had endeavoured to redeem, by annihilating the nomination boroughs, and diminishing the temptation to corruption, by placing the franchise in the hands of the middle classes. The nomin-



ation boroughs might, no doubt, be occasionally useful, by introducing distinguished men into parliament, though it did not follow that they would not have got in some other way ; but any advantage of this nature was more than counterbalanced by their putting it in the power of persons of large property to dictate to the ministry of the day—a dictation which must constantly interfere with good government. The total, or partial, disfranchisement of the small boroughs could never be placed side by side with the attacks made on their charters by James II. The latter attacked the boroughs for the purpose of subverting the constitution ; but the present measure was to establish, not to destroy, freedom of election ; not to curtail or impair, but to improve and enlarge the representation of the people. Neither ought the proposed bill to be regarded as merely a first step—as something which was not to be final. In so far as he was concerned, he did propose it as a final settlement. It might be supposed that his own opinion would have been favourable to a somewhat different measure ; but he thought the best way to succeed in what he had long aimed at as the great object of his political life, was to sacrifice some of his own opinions. Having, therefore, united with his colleagues, and agreed upon the measure, he felt himself pledged to support it, and not to go beyond it. He thought that great advantage would be secured to the country by the proposition, and that the measure would be sufficient to place that House, as it ought to be, under the influence of the great body of the intelligent and respectable classes of the community.

Mr. Hume frankly declared

that, radical reformer as he was, the plan proposed much exceeded what he had expected ; that, with all his disposition to put confidence in ministers, he was not prepared to find them come forward with so manly a measure. They had fully redeemed their pledge ; and though, in his own opinion, the omission to shorten the duration of parliaments, and to introduce the ballot, were deficiencies, yet, as these were points on which a large portion of the members had not been able to make up their minds, ministers had acted wisely in not encumbering the present measure with them, as they could be brought forward at any time as entire questions. In regard to the measure itself, a few of the details might be objected to, but there was so much good, so much advantage to the crown and to the aristocracy in this bill, that he would not, in consequence of any of the details, throw the least objection in the way of the success of any part of the measure. Undoubtedly, in the course of the proceedings through which the measure had to pass, suggestions would be offered to government of moderate alterations in the details, which they might be satisfied would render the plan more efficient ; ministers would act properly in adopting those suggestions, with the view of perfecting their own plan of reform. With these statements, he could assure the House, that all those with whom he had conversed were satisfied with the measure. Even many whom he knew to be the strongest reformers in England, were perfectly satisfied, and allowed that they had the utmost reason to be delighted. It was the perfection and wisdom of every government to meet the rising wishes of the country, and to ef-



fect, by degrees, those changes which circumstances required, gradually and properly, under the legal authorities calculated to effect them, and not to risk those useful changes by substituting any thing such as had been brought forward at former times, and in other places, having all the pretensions of entire and infallible wisdom. He had no doubt, though many might think the qualifications for voting too high, there was too much good sense in the British community not to feel that vast good was to be obtained by this measure, that, though some might not immediately participate in its benefits, yet great advantage would result to the community.

Mr. Baring Wall stated, that he was decidedly opposed to the measure, and looked upon any plan of reform proceeding from the present government with suspicion. The House had been told, that the cabinet was unanimous; but when had that unanimity been made apparent, and how had it been brought about? There had been none till the eleventh hour; and even then it had been effected, according to the statements of ministers themselves, by compromise and shifting. One member of the cabinet gave up the ballot; another sacrificed the close boroughs; a third threw overboard the Scottish counties. Unanimity, in proposing such a measure, was to him no recommendation. He would have looked at it with less doubt, if the cabinet had come to so momentous a question with anxiety, fear, and trembling, instead of rushing to a rash and extravagant conclusion. That it would satisfy the reformers, whose clamours were now made to constitute its justification, was a glaring fallacy. No measure had ever

been brought forward, with the professed intention of meeting the views of the people, in which the discrepancies were so great between the measure and the petitions. The Examiner newspaper, and the Westminster Review spoke the sentiments of one class of reformers, certainly not the most moderate, nor the least daring and clamorous, and the House would be able to judge how far the proposed change would meet the views of these persons. "Ballot," said the Examiner, "is the instrument that will break our bonds asunder, and dash to the dust all the foul powers of the oligarchy. We must not omit to mention, that we observed this significant circumstance at the Middlesex meeting, that fervent loyalty to the throne was expressed, together with the choice of civil war, in preference to submission to existing grievances. Efficient reform will turn the privileges of the peers to dust and rottenness." The Westminster Review was equally energetic. "Anarchy is fearful, but it is a passage sharp and short; while the misrule, under which the nation has suffered every injury, moral, political, and financial, is a chronic disease, a continuous affliction, spoiling the health, the temper, and spirit of the community; and, should it come to the question of passing through the fiery ordeal of anarchy, or supporting the system that threatens us with it, we speak the sentiments of tens of thousands, when we assert that the crisis would be preferred to the maintaining the oligarchy in its accursed domination. The aristocracy have had their long and disastrous day; it is now the time of the Demos. The choice is momentous. Reform in parlia-



ment, with the ballot, and a national guard, or the aristocracy and anarchy." The House would thus see, that, if its object was, to meet popular claims, the measure proposed would not be efficient. Then came the class of moderate reformers. If they were asked what they wanted, they gave no direct reply; they dwelt in generalities—they could not say what they wanted, or how far they were prepared to go. Of that class he spoke with much respect, for he was one of it. What they required it was difficult to say; but much that they objected to had been excellently well set forth in a speech of extraordinary ability, which was made in that House by the present lord Dudley, in 1817, and, strange to say, had not been answered up to the present time, 1831. But, before these moderate reformers attempted to develop their own plans and wishes, there was one thing which was absolutely necessary, and that was, to get rid of, destroy, and turn out, the measure brought forward by the noble lord. That measure, in fact, could not stand; it was impossible it should do so; and to get rid of it should be the first object of the moderate reformer. That done, he, for one, should be ready to inquire and see what improvements could be made in the representation. There was no possibility of saying what plan had regulated the disposal of the right of returning members to that house. This he felt to be the case, and he should say that, as there was no system in the representation, so there was no system in his reform. Even if the harshness and injustice of disfranchising so many boroughs could be overlooked, one consequence of the

principle of the proposed bill would be, that, as they grew old, the southern part of the kingdom would be left almost without representation. In the county to which he belonged, three boroughs were to be disfranchised. Two members were, however, to be added to the county; but that would be but a poor return for the loss of six members; and Portsmouth was to be thrown open. Portsmouth had hitherto been a Whig borough, but, thrown open, it would return two junior lords of the Admiralty, let who would be ministers. Then a part of the measure was to divide the counties, as they would police districts; but how would all the principle of the measure operate? It was well known, from the great advantages the north enjoyed in possessing coals and machinery, that the population would travel northward, and the consequence would be, that, in a short period, Hants, Wilts, Dorset, aye, and Surrey too, would be left almost without representatives. Look to another part of the measure. Certain districts in the metropolis were to have representatives, and, among others, Marylebone was to be thus distinguished. Why, in two years, Paddington would be requiring delegates, and Hampstead would be factious for representatives. This was evident, and yet the noble lord talked of the final settlement of the question. The measure was one of constant change. Supposing the plan had been adopted in 1800, what would have become of Brighton and of Cheltenham? In some places, the growth of population was extraordinary; and yet ministers had been in so much haste, that they



could not wait for the result of the census which their own officers were then making.

Lord Newark confessed, that the measure was more sweeping than he had expected, and he hoped it would be modified. He would support any reasonable reform; but, if the question came to be, this reform, or none at all, he would vote for the bill. Lord Darlington, too, though he would not go the length of saying that no concession should be made, and admitted the necessity of giving representatives to the large towns, was unwilling to accede to an alteration so sweeping and so general as that now proposed, which affected the very vitals of the constitution, and raised the question, whether the sovereign power was to be lodged in King, Lords, and Commons, or to be transferred to the people alone. Lord Stormont said, he would not oppose the bringing in of the bill, in order that the country might have an opportunity of knowing, and fully considering, this most extraordinary proposition—a measure which, calling itself reform, was to end in revolution, as it began with setting up spoliation in the place of possession. Lord Ebrington, on the other hand, expressed his full approbation of the whole plan. It was efficient and full; and, because it was so, it was safe. He owed his seat, and he was proud of owing it, to persons belonging to the middle classes; but he was nevertheless connected with the aristocracy, and he should be the last in the world to desire to see that body overthrown; but he apprehended no such result from the present measure, and he hailed with great satisfaction a bill, the object of

which was, to increase the numbers and influence, amongst the constitutional body, of the class to whom he owed his seat. He had been, he confessed it, for many years a moderate reformer; he was for paring off gradually a few at a time of the imperfections which had arisen upon the body of the representation, getting rid at intervals of some of the decayed and rotten boroughs; but he since had reason to change his opinions. On the most mature reflection, he had arrived at the full persuasion, that, if the principle were once conceded; the removal of one portion of the abuses existing would leave the remaining parts without defence. He therefore hailed with satisfaction a measure which would give due weight to all the several portions of the constitutional body, and to every interest in the state; and he hoped, that, when the bill was passed, it would have the effect—as far as any human law could have such an effect—of conciliating the people of the empire; and, in a great degree, revive that sympathy and confidence which had subsisted, and ought to subsist, between the constituency and their representatives.

Mr. Macaulay commenced a very spirited piece of rhetoric in defence of ministers, under whose patronage he sat in the House, by declaring that he supported the measure, because he was opposed to universal suffrage; because he looked with horror on the thought of any thing in the shape of revolution, and believed that the proposed change was the best security against all possibility of revolution. If he wished to set before the House, in the strongest light, the evils of the present system of



representation, he would refer to the northern part of this city. If he wished to make that foreigner, who had been introduced first into the debate by the noble lord who opened it, fully sensible of the peculiar evils of our system, he would conduct him to that great city which lies to the north of Oxford-street, and the west of Russell-square. There he would shew him a city exceeding in size the capitals of many kingdoms, and even superior in intelligence and knowledge to any city on the face of the globe. He would there show him long lines of interminable streets and spacious squares, filled with well-built magnificent houses, inhabited by opulent and intelligent men, some of the first citizens of the state. He would show that stranger the magnificent shops, the splendid apartments; he would like to carry him to the palaces that stretch along each side of the Regent's-park, and he would tell him that the rental of these palaces and houses exceeded the rental of all Scotland at the time of the Union—and then he would tell the stranger, that all this wealth and intelligence were unrepresented. He should not need to refer him to Leeds or Manchester, or Mac-clesfield, or to tell him that Scotland had only the shadow of a representation. The principle of the Property-tax was, that no income below a certain amount per annum should be taxed; and he doubted, should he include only the property assessed to that tax, if he should find one-half of the persons who paid that tax had any votes for representatives. One-fiftieth part of those persons returned a greater number of representatives than did the other forty-nine parts. Ours,

then, was not a government on the principle of property; it was only a government founded on some fragments of property, and no principle whatever presided over its formation. It had been said, that it was never better than at present; but the House was there to inquire into what it ought to be, not into what it had been; they were legislators, not antiquaries. They could not possibly think it right, that the seat of government should be transferred from London to York, because York was the capital of the country in the time of Constantius Chlorus? Was the representation of the country, adapted for two millions of people, to be kept now as it had been in the 13th century? New property had been called into existence; society had assumed a different form; much wealth and much capital, which were formerly unknown, were now unrepresented. Some towns had sunk to villages; others had remained stationary; but many had risen from villages to be as large as London in the time of the Plantagenets. Society had grown the form of the government must be renewed to make it accord with that on which it depended; and it was time that our old institutions should be new-modelled.

If it was true, as had been said on the other side, that a House of Commons, reformed according to the proposed plan, would destroy our king and peers in ten years—that the property and intelligence of the middle classes could not be adequately represented without the result being to pull down the majesty of the throne, and the dignity of the aristocracy—if that were a true representation, it spoke volumes against the monarchy and the peerage. Monarchy and aris-



tocracy were not valuable in themselves: they were only means to an end; and if the bill should produce a republic by improving the representation—though he was convinced it would have no such effect—what did that imply but that the peerage and the crown were opposed to the welfare of the nation. If the subversion of the king and peers were the only objection to the measure, then there was no ground for opposing it. But the people did not forget what was due to the king, and what was due to the peers; it was against that House that the popular voice was raised. They had not lost their respect for the king—they had not lost their respect for the aristocracy, so long as the aristocracy remained in its proper sphere; but they had lost their respect for the representative system of the country; and there was good reason why they should, for *corruptio optimi pessima*.

Further, it was said that many great and eminent men had been returned for nomination boroughs. True; but in estimating such facts, you must look at general tendencies, not at accidents. It would scarcely be possible to hit on any mode of election which would not bring some able men into the House; and if the boroughs were done away with, able men would still find their way into it. If one hundred of the tallest men in the kingdom were to be elected members of parliament, some among them would be eminent. If one hundred men of a tawney complexion were to be representatives, men of eminence, too, would be found amongst them. In ancient times, a king was chosen by the neighing of a horse; and, though nobody would recommend that mode of election, it might

happen that the one so chosen might be a good king. In Athens public officers were chosen by lot—not a rational mode of election; yet it once caused Socrates to be chosen. Whatever might be our system of representation, clever men would find their way into the House. They might not be the same men as would come in under the borough system; but they would be men of talents, and no one man was indispensably necessary. Give a country good institutions, and it will be sure to find good and great men. The feeling of the people, which could not be denied, was said to be temporary—to have sprung from the events which had taken place in France and Belgium. On the contrary, it possessed all the symptoms of a deeply-rooted malady, and had been growing for two generations. The legislature had tried every means in its power to put an end to it. Was it to be supposed that any probable measure of cure had escaped the subtlety of Burke, or the sagacity of Windham? Had not every species of coercion been tried by lord Londonderry? Had not laws been passed to put down public meetings and to enthrall the press, and was not the evil still in existence, increasing from day to day? What new palliatives could they try? Now, then, when every thing was alarming around us, when the spirit of the age had just crushed the proudest crown in Europe, and the palace of our monarch was supplying an ignominious asylum to the expelled heir of forty kings—but while the heart of England was yet sound—while the national feelings of many old associations were yet retained bound to the honour and character of the country, and which



might soon, too soon, pass away—now was the accepted time, this was the day of our salvation, when, if we acted with a due regard to the signs of these portentous times, the great debt due from the aristocracy to the people should be paid: and if it were paid, the deed would never be forgotten by the people, whose happiness it would insure.

Mr. Hunt, member for the pot-walloping borough of Preston, and, after Mr. Hume, the most ultra-reformer in the House, declared he had not heard a single word that was new to him: all that had been said in the House had been said twenty years ago by the weavers of Lancashire. As the bill was not to touch the rights of his constituents, he would give it his support; but he was sorry that so little was said about the ballot, and the duration of parliaments. The suffrage was not widely enough extended. If the rabble, as they were called, were not to have votes, he wished to know whether they were still to be liable to pay taxes, and to serve in the militia? The people fought the battles of the country, and were they to be denied representation, merely to transfer it to the middle classes? No man, however poor or low, could infringe the law with impunity; his ignorance would be no excuse; why then should he not have a vote in the election of those who made the law?

After lord Morpeth had expressed his intention of supporting the bill, as being a sure means of escaping the dangers which surrounded the country if it remained where it was, Sir Charles Wetherell addressed the House. It was astonishing, he said, to observe the difference produced on a man by sitting on one side of the House

rather than on the other. The noble mover of this bill had been only six or eight weeks in office as paymaster of the forces, yet he had acquired military habits, and proposed to cashier 120 corporations unheard, thus uniting military proscription with parliamentary reform. One hundred and sixty-seven members were to be dismissed by a species of proceeding, which, in compliance with the recommendation of Locke—to give everything its true name—he would call a corporation robbery. The total result was to be, that, by pursuing a system of pillage and plunder towards some, and of generosity and munificence towards others, the number of members in the House was to be diminished by sixty-two. This diminution, he must confess, appeared to him an odd proposition. It had never occurred as desirable to those reformers whom Mr. Hunt took under his special charge; it had never been proposed by the reforming population, but had been reserved for a reforming cabinet. Yet it had not the merit of originality. Ministers, in reducing the number of members, were only imitating the conduct of Cromwell, Fairfax, and Co.; and, indeed, the reforming plan of the present government was almost the same in form and substance as the reforming plan of that government, which, after the commission of regicide, proceeded to establish a commonwealth in England. Ministers professed that they wished to preserve the institutions of the country—to uphold the principle of conservation, to avoid every thing calculated to degrade the church, diminish the rank and dignity of the House of Lords, or weaken the crown; but



still it did so happen that this conservative plan of theirs was similar to that of Cromwell, after the assassination of the monarch, and the destruction of the peerage. Yet the House was told, that all who opposed this measure must be prepared to negative all reform. He was not one of those who were ready to negative all possible reform; he had never maintained that no improvement could be made in the state of the representation; he had never argued, that the election laws were incapable of amendment, or that there were no places in the kingdom at present unrepresented, on which the elective franchise could be beneficially conferred; yet ministers said, "unless you agree to our terms, you will show yourselves the enemies of all possible reform." That might be thought very good logic in Downing-street, but he was sure it would not be reckoned so, either in that House, or in the country. The measure had been characterized, too, as being merely an experiment; but did the men who so characterized it reflect that there were rather too many experiments making on governments at the present moment—that there was a smithy where political blacksmiths were at work, forging new constitutions for all Europe? Did they recollect the endeavours to make a new government for Greece? Did they remember that a new charter had been tried in Portugal? Did they recollect the unsettled relations of Belgium, or the condition of France? Had they forgotten that the states of South America had been for eight or ten years endeavouring to form stable institutions, and that in no one instance had they been successful? Yet this was the time which ministers had select-

ed to sketch out a new constitution; as if the existing constitution of Great Britain had not, from age to age, been undergoing improvement and emendation. At a time when all the states of Europe were in so disturbed a condition, this country was to put to sea, under the flag of the noble lord, on a voyage of experiment and discovery in quest of a new constitution.

He repeated, that the provision, by which the constituents of 160 members were to be deprived of their franchises, was a corporation robbery. He by no means asserted that the omnipotence of parliament was not co-extensive with any purpose to which it might be required to be applied; but it had hitherto been thought, that any act of parliament destructive of popular privileges was as liable to censure as a similar act on the part of the crown. If the violation of any chartered rights by ministers were a criminal deed, the same principle rendered the deed equally criminal when perpetrated by parliament; and those rights which were established by prescription were as valid as those which were established by charter. No parliamentary confiscation of any charter had ever before been attempted, except in cases of delinquency; but now, without any trial, without any conviction, without any fault, the civil and constitutional rights of numerous bodies of men were to be taken away by the arbitrary edict of a theorist; while those who truly adhered to the constitution were stigmatized as bigots, because they did not forthwith give their uncompromising adherence to the new laws proclaimed by a consolidated and unanimous cabinet, which went upon the novel principle in the



administration of justice, of condemning without trial and deciding without hearing. The principle upon which the government were proceeding was, he contended, perfectly false. It would, unless he were, indeed, most grossly mistaken, appear from the journals of the House, that never since the days of Richard II, had any minister presumed to propose to that House the confiscation of any charter. Perhaps the noble lord had in his view the confiscations of church property in the times of Henry VIII, and wished to call them into precedent. Certainly they had been suffered to sleep in the accumulated dust of ages, and would in all probability never have been again drawn into light, except by a combined, or united, and an unanimous cabinet. But now there did certainly seem to be a marvellous similarity in the system of proceeding adopted by the military Paymaster and Harry the Eighth, when he was minded to get possession of the property of the Ecclesiastical Corporations. All those charters, which were freely surrendered, were greedily accepted; but the abbots of large monasteries, who would not surrender their charters, were indicted for high treason, as, for instance, the abbots of Reading, of Glastonbury, and of Winchester; and when the charters were thus wrung from them, it was called a surrender. Now, this robbery was perpetrated *secundum artem*, and it was, no doubt, an admirable model to be followed under the new system of military law, whereby charters were to be forfeited without a trial, and much less without proof of delinquency in those who held them. But he was really curious to hear by what sound argument

—by what show of reason—by what apparition of authorities—by what shadow of facts—by what strain of sophistry—they could account, or pretend to account, for their invasion of long-received and time-honoured principles, the extinguishing of established rights, and the confiscation of property which that House had always esteemed, and was bound to esteem, sacred. Did ministers mean that the violence they now were minded to perpetrate against the elective rights of the corporations should be exclusively confined to this branch of the constitution? If they confiscated charters for one object, they might with equal ease do so for another; if they acted upon a principle of spoliation in one quarter, they might freely extend it to all. The church held its property under charter. The peerage enjoyed its rights under instruments granted under the Great Seal—the Bank of England, the East-India Company, the corporations, all exist under charters, and enjoy their property, their privileges, their municipal authority, under the faith of charters. All of them could be reached by the mischievous principle now promulgated, which left no safety for the monied interests, the landed interests, the peerage, or the church. He who broke in and bore away the archives of a town house, would not hesitate much about plundering a cathedral.

It was instructive, too, to mark the difference between the noble mover and the radicals behind him, in regard to the character and consequences of the proposed bill. The former described it as a pacific measure—one that was to heal all wounds, and allay all irritation; one that was to be of the most auspicious



cious augury to the middle classes—holding forth to them good promise of comfort, and happiness, and prosperity, that was to say, to all who could prove a clear possession of ten pounds a-year. But the radicals, on the contrary, exclaimed that there was nothing done, and that the community would be split into two classes, which would be placed in hostile array against each other; for the multitude under this system would have no vote at all; and therefore, it was argued, would be in no degree gainers by it. It was clear at least from this, that the people would be divided into two classes of different and opposing pretensions; and yet this was the pacification the noble lord held out to the House of Commons. Aye, truly: was that the healing measure—was that the oil which was to be poured into the wounds, and at once destroy their virulency, and abate all irritated feelings. And this, forsooth, was the great remedy for all the ills the country laboured under. He should like to hear how the right hon. the first lord of the Admiralty would explain at Cockermouth to his constituents his conduct since he last addressed them. On that occasion retrenchment unlimited was to be the order of the day;—all taxes burdensome to the middle and poorer classes were to be removed, and the constitution was to be restored to its ancient splendour, by a full and satisfactory measure of reform. Now what answer could the right hon. baronet make to one of his agricultural constituents, if thus accosted by him, “Well, sir James, have you taken off the malt-tax?” “No,” quoth the right hon. baronet. “Have you,” rejoins the farmer, “at least, taken off the

assessed taxes?” “No,” again quoth the first lord of the Admiralty, “the House of Commons, and a sense of duty prevented me.” “Then,” again quoth the farmer, “since you have neither repealed the malt-tax, nor the assessed taxes, what the d—l have you done?” “Why, we have not to be sure, much reduced taxes, but, to make amends, we have taken off sixty-two members.” And the merry conceit might pass on the hustings, as a redemption of all his pledges of retrenchment and economy. They most certainly proposed a pretty considerable and somewhat novel species of retrenchment as a remedy for the ills of the country, reminding one of the process of that eminent practitioner, Mr. St. John Long.\* They found one sore a grievance, and they established a raw, by which they made the whole surface a mass of sores—and this they called reform. He hoped that some member of the cabinet would rise and explain the system of reform which was to amputate no less than sixty-two members of Parliament. There existed in Cromwell’s time a purge of the House of Commons. The purge was called colonel Pride’s purge. The gentlemen on the opposite side of the House were close imitators of the Cromwellian system, not only of his system of parliamentary reform, but also of his sanatory purgative system; for they were prepared to expel, by one strong dose, no less than 168 members of that House. He did not know what name he ought to attach to this specific; for he had not conceived it possible that the country would see a repetition

---

\* See Chronicle p. 34.



of such a process a second time. Within the last three days, however, the House had been promised a purge, to which, as no name had yet been attached, he would attach the name of Russell's purge. He would call this bill Russell's Purge of Parliament. Its principle was republican in its basis: it was destructive of all property, of all right, of all privilege: and the same arbitrary violence, which expelled a majority of members from that House, in the time of the Commonwealth, was now, after the lapse of a century from the Revolution, during which we had enjoyed greater happiness than was ever enjoyed by any population under Heaven, proceeding to expose the House of Commons again to the nauseous experiment of a repetition of Pride's Purge.

The Attorney-general denied that any parallel could be drawn between the measure now presented to the House, and the reformatations of Cromwell. There had been two alterations in the House in Cromwell's time; at the earlier period, the change was effected by violence; at the later by a plan brought forward on a conservative principle—a plan by which the three estates were to be retained mutilated in some respects, indeed, but still preserved in form as the government of the country. There was, perhaps, the same object in view—namely, a change in the House of Commons; but that was the only point in which the two cases resembled each other, for the plan now proposed went on conservative and restorative principles, while, on the other, the Protector brought in his soldiers, and forcibly took away the mace. Still less could it be said there was any similarity in the present to the prin-

ciple of the cases of *quo warranto*? Was this case to be put upon a parallel with the interfering with the rights of corporations? Was it an attempt to deprive them of their legitimate municipal powers? Surely the power of voting for members of parliament was not a municipal privilege; still less so was the power of selling to some duke or lord this valuable privilege.

The Attorney-general went on to say, that not one argument had been used by the opponents of the measure which did not go the length of declaring that no reform whatever was necessary. These members had not taken any practical view of the subject till this moment, when they were actually driven into doing so. What plan of reform had they ever proposed, or what plan did they even now propose? He knew of none, unless they called that a plan which consisted in introducing *ex post facto* laws against Evesham and East Retford—unless they called that a plan which was only a bill of pains and penalties, agreed upon by some committee, no one member of which owed his seat to means more pure than those which, as a member of that committee, he was formally to condemn. If that were a plan, against any such plan he protested, as one of needless expense, great waste of time, and insulting hypocrisy. Even the duke of Wellington, who declared at the commencement of the present Session that no reform was necessary, had been willing, during last Session, to disfranchise East Retford: he had been ready to make that miserable sacrifice in the expectation that it would satisfy the wishes of the people. That readiness admitted in effect



that some reform was necessary, but the people would not be satisfied with reform to that extent; and those who admitted reform to that extent, were bound, having admitted the principle, to carry it farther than by merely applying it to the passing of an *ex post facto* law, the institution of committees, or the punishment of abuses accidentally discovered. It was said, that talent and rank, the wealthy in trade, and others who had elevated themselves in the world, made their entry into the House by means of the impure boroughs. It might be very true, that they did; but then it was notorious that that object was gained by seats in the House being bought and sold. Why, then, was not East Retford, or any other borough to be allowed to drive the same traffic? Why prohibit the poor man to sell his solitary vote, while you allow the rich man to sell all the votes of all the electors? Who could expect the people to submit to this? If it was necessary that peers should return their nominees, why was it that every peer had not his nominee, like his chaplain or his steward? The privilege was not granted to his rank or station, but belonged to him through the accident of having purchased the borough which returned the two members; and thus he acquired the power of influencing the deliberations of that House, and made it worth the while of the crown to consult his interests and his wishes. Was it possible that any thing could be worse? Under such circumstances the question was, whether the House should wait for another instance of particular delinquency, or whether the boroughs should no longer be permitted to send representatives, and the

state of the representation should be put on a sounder footing.

For the necessity of reform they had the authority of Chatham, Pitt, Fox, and Burke. Mr. Pitt had declared that, with such a House of Commons, no honest man could be minister of the country; and Mr. Fox had afterwards adopted the sentiment, when, on Mr. Pitt taking office, he said, with great bitterness, that Pitt seemed destined to prove the truth of his own prophecy. In the year 1780, Mr. Pitt introduced a plan to get rid of forty boroughs, and then a compulsory compensation was proposed: but he believed that none of those who were to have been called on to receive it would have considered themselves well used in being forced to accept it. He did not, however, know that any compensation was constitutional for property so bought, or whether any act of that sort was not itself illegal, and liable to prosecution under the bribery laws. If a peer, or any other holder of a borough, made a bargain to admit a man to that House for a certain stipulated sum, or on condition of voting in a certain manner, he would not only be guilty of a gross breach of the privileges of that House, but would be liable to an indictment for his offence.

To the argument that the system had been productive of no practical evil, it was enough to say, that the people, for a century, had not been happy under it. They had been a suffering people—suffering by the acts of that House, injuries inflicted on them by means which the constitution condemned, and which the people required to be reformed. As to the allusions made to occurrences in France of modern or of more ancient date, he would



ask, whether it was possible that that dynasty should remain upon the throne, which had ordered the military to fire upon the people? Was that, too, a revolution to be viewed with horror and disgust, which was merely a resistance to arbitrary power and the resort of self defence? There might be some reason to lament that the French people did not so well know how to improve a victory as to gain it: but in whatever situation he might be placed, he never would consent to put the recent events in Belgium in comparison with the

achievements of those three glorious days when the French people defended their fire-sides and their families, and not only asserted but maintained their rights against a degrading and detestable tyranny. But what, in fact, had the futile efforts of arbitrary monarchy, or the illegal violence of an excited population, to do with a question like the present, which related to a measure which had the high sanction of the government, and, above all, the intelligent approval of a great, free, and enlightened people?



## CHAP. II.

*Continuation of the Debate on the Motion for leave to bring in the Reform Bill—Speech of Mr. Bankes—Mr. Hobhouse—Mr. Baring—Lord Palmerston—Sir Robert Peel—Mr. Stanley—The Lord Advocate—Mr. Croker—Mr. Hope—Mr. R. Grant—Mr. O'Connell—Mr. Attwood—Sir James Graham—Bill allowed to be brought in without a Division, and read a First Time.*

THE third night's debate was opened by Mr. Bankes, who complained of the profound secrecy in which ministers had most unaccountably thought it necessary to wrap up their scheme, till the very moment when it was presented to the House. If the measure was so popular, what had they seen to fear? What danger did they expect to avoid, what advantage did they hope to gain, by having recourse to so unusual a contrivance. He complained likewise of the use which had been made of the king's name to gain supporters to the bill, and of a very intelligible hint which had been given by sir James Graham, the first lord of the Admiralty, that if the House refused to pass the bill, the king would dissolve them. He repeated the arguments which had been already urged against the wholesale spoliation of the boroughs, unjustified by any one precedent to which a good citizen would ever wish to refer. The Attorney-general had talked of one of Cromwell's reforms being founded on a conservative principle, and if members would only look to the history of that parliament, they would see the value of bodies so constituted. It was only two years since a part of our parlia-

mentary debates, containing that period, had been recovered, and it appeared that every thing absurd, futile, and ridiculous had taken place in this reformed parliament. Cromwell had given that parliament two trials, the first of five months, and the second of sixteen days, at the end of which he dissolved them, with the following speech: "I had very comfortable expectations, that God would make the meeting of this parliament a blessing; and the Lord be my witness, I desired the carrying on the affairs of the nation to these ends. Having proceeded upon these terms, and finding such a spirit as is too much predominant, every thing being too high or too low, where virtue, honesty, piety, and justice are omitted, I thought I had been doing that which was my duty, and thought it would have satisfied you; but if every thing must be too high or too low, you are not to be satisfied. You have not only disjointed yourselves, but the whole nation, which is in likelihood of running into more confusion in these fifteen or sixteen days that you have sat, than it hath been from the rising of the last Session to this day. And if this be the end of your sitting, and if this be your carriage, I



think it high time that an end be put to your sitting, and I dissolve this parliament, and let God judge between me and you." That was the parliament which had been reformed and amended according to what the Attorney-general called, "a conservative principle," unable to protect either itself or the country. The proceedings, which had terminated in the framing of this parliament, had surely been revolutionary enough; and the essence and tendency of the measure now proposed were equally entitled to be so characterized. He should like, at least, to know how those members and adherents of the present ministry, who, while Mr. Huskisson lived, had been his followers and associates, could refuse to give it that name, without renouncing all their former creed. No farther back than the 23rd of February, 1830, Mr. Huskisson had said in that House, "as to a more extensive parliamentary reform, a measure founded upon the principle of a general revision, reconstruction, and remodelling of our present constitution—to such a general revision and change of our constitution, he had been always opposed, and while he had a seat in that House, he should give it his most decided opposition. He conceived, that if such an extensive reform were effected, they might go on for two or three Sessions in good and easy times, and such a reformed parliament might adapt itself to our mode of government, and the ordinary concerns of the country; but if such an extensive change were effected in the constitution of parliament, sure he was that whenever an occasion arose of great popular excitement or reaction, the consequence would be a total subversion of our con-

stitution, followed by a complete confusion and anarchy, terminating first in the tyranny of a fierce democracy, and then in that of a military despotism, these two great calamities maintaining the natural order of succession which they have been always hitherto seen to observe." Not more than twelve months ago, Mr. Huskisson had denounced in this strong and emphatic language, any measure of such a description. Such measures were so denounced by a man who belonged not to the aristocracy of the country—who had sprung himself from the people, and who felt with them and for them. With the weight of such an authority against them, even those who had been always friendly to such measures should pause and reflect, before they proposed them; but that the political associates of Mr. Huskisson—that the men who had been bred up under him, and who held the principles which had been held by him—should, so soon after his death, be parties to the introduction of such a measure as the present, was certainly a most extraordinary and unaccountable fact.

Mr. Hobhouse said, that the example which Mr. Bankes had selected of Cromwell's reformed parliament was the very worst, for the opponents of the bill, on which he could have fixed. If he had only looked into a page of Hume, he would have found that Cromwell dismissed that parliament for the very reason that some persons would wish for such a parliament now—because it did represent the people of England—because he found that the mace was hardly laid on the table, when they began, not to exert themselves in favour of tyranny, not to flatter the Protector, not to



prove complying tools in the hands of ambition, but to pull to pieces the instruments of the government. This was the offence committed by that representation which lord Clarendon had declared to be worthy of better times, and which Cromwell found to be incompatible with the tyranny he meditated. In like manner the examples, which had been referred to in order to frighten the House with the idea that they would render parliament too pure for the safety of the crown, were misrepresentations of history. Charles the 1st had not received his doom from the democracy of England, nor in consequence of their aversion to monarchical power, but because, when an attempt was made by the party uppermost to come to terms with the king, they discovered that he had a mental reservation, by means of which he was determined not to keep his bargain. It was the usurping army, not the people, that put Charles to death. Moreover the parliament of that time was a borough parliament. It contained but sixteen members for counties, and six for cities; the remainder were all for boroughs. The example of Spain, too, had been quoted to shew the impossibility of a purely democratic assembly co-existing with a monarchy. But it was not the Cortes that dethroned Ferdinand VII. Ferdinand dethroned himself, with the aid of a French army marched into Spain contrary to the law of nations. Sicily, likewise, had been pointed at. But why had the two principles not been found compatible there? Because lord Castlereagh had made his famous settlement of Europe, the consequences of which were before their eyes every day. Last-

ly, the late French revolution had again been called up to haunt them. He thought it was agreed on all hands that the revolution of 1830 was an experiment which the French people were justified in making; and it was not because the Chamber of Deputies represented the people too much that the two parties in France were ready to go to war—it was because it did not represent the people enough.

To the argument that parliament, in disfranchising the boroughs, would be guilty of some unjustifiable act of confiscation—a corporation robbery, as it had been called—he would only oppose an authority which, to the opponents of reform, ought to be unanswerable, that of Mr. Pitt. Mr. Pitt, in a speech delivered on the 31st of January, 1798, on the legislative union between England and Ireland, spoke thus regarding the power of parliament to take away corporate rights, and disfranchise such boroughs as it might think fit: “If this principle of the incompetency of Parliament to the decision of the measure be admitted, or if it be contended that Parliament has no legitimate authority to discuss and decide upon it, you will be driven to the necessity of recognising a principle the most dangerous that ever was adopted in any civilized state. I mean the principle that Parliament cannot adopt any measure new in its nature, and of great importance, without appealing for directions to the constituent and delegating authority. If that doctrine be true, look to what an extent it will carry you. If such an argument could be set up and maintained, you acted without any legitimate authority, when you cre-



ated the representation of the principality of Wales, or of either of the counties palatine of England. Every law that Parliament ever made, without that appeal, either as to its own frame and constitution, as to the qualifications of the electors or the elected, as to the great and fundamental point of the succession to the Crown, was a breach of treaty, and an act of usurpation. If we turn to Ireland itself, what do gentlemen think of the power of that Parliament, which, without any fresh delegation from its Protestant constituents, associates to itself all the Catholic electors, and thus destroys a fundamental distinction on which it was formed? God forbid, that I should object to, or blame any of these measures. I am only stating the extent to which the principle, that Parliament has no authority to decide upon the present measure, will lead; and, if it be admitted in one case, it must be admitted in all. Will any man say, that (although a Protestant Parliament in Ireland, chosen exclusively by Protestant constituents, has, by its own inherent power, and without consulting those constituents, admitted and comprehended the Catholics, who were till then, in fact, a separate community) Parliament cannot associate itself with another Protestant community, represented by a Protestant Parliament, having one interest with itself, and similar in its law, its constitution, and its established religion? What must be said by those who have at any time been friends to any plan of Parliamentary Reform, and particularly such as have been most recently brought forward, either in Great Britain or Ireland? Whatever may have been thought

of the propriety of the measure, I never heard any doubt of the competency of Parliament to consider and discuss it. Yet I defy any man to maintain the principle of those plans, without contending that, as a member of Parliament, he possesses a right to concur in disfranchising those who sent him to Parliament, and to select others, by whom he was not elected, in their stead." Mr. Pitt still more strongly expresses himself against the principle insisted upon by sir Charles Wetherell, in the immediately succeeding passage: "I am sure," continued Mr. Pitt, "that no sufficient distinction, in point of principle, can be successfully maintained for a single moment; nor should I deem it necessary to dwell upon this point in the manner I do, were I not convinced that it is connected, in part, with all those false and dangerous notions on the subject of government which have lately become too prevalent in the world. It may, in fact, be traced to that gross perversion of the principles of all political society, which rests on the supposition, that there exists continually, in every government, a sovereignty in abeyance, as it were, on the part of the people; ready to be called forth on every occasion, or rather on every pretence, when it may suit the purposes of party or faction, who are the advocates of this doctrine, to support an occasion for its exertion." After an argument so masterly and overpowering, the House, he should think, must now have done with the arguments about corporation robbery, and the incompetence of Parliament to deal with corporate franchises.

Still more clear, in his opinion, was the justice, the expediency,



the necessity of dealing with these boroughs, as this bill did deal with them. It was not from the extension of the franchise that danger was to be apprehended. Danger, he believed, there was, but it came from a totally different and distinct quarter to that to which some honourable gentlemen were most ready to ascribe it. The danger, as he conceived, arose from that blind, benighted, selfish class of politicians—if politicians they could be called—who, in spite of what had passed, and was still passing around them, were still left in the double night of ignorance and presumption, and would rather that thrones should be subverted, and empires crumbled into dust, than forego one iota of their own petty interests and long-cherished prejudices. The last speaker had taunted the friends of Mr. Huskisson with abandoning his principles; but he ought rather to have learned wisdom from the example of his own former leader (sir R. Peel). When that right hon. gentleman was doing himself immortal honour by carrying through the Catholic Relief Bill, the House had heard one of his own relations read against him one of his own speeches. Did that, however, deter him from persevering in his object? If it had, instead of earning the high character which he now enjoyed, and having entitled himself to the gratitude of the country, he would have held himself up as a politician who had not studied the signs of the times, and who had not the magnanimity, or the patriotism, to prefer the good of the country to his own consistency. Let not such men entertain the idea that Reform would exclude them from the House. His own opinion was, and it formed one of his reasons for

supporting Reform, that he did not think the complexion of that House, individually, would be much changed by the success of the question. Let them make any change consistent with the principles of the constitution, and they would have the best men in that House whom the constituency could find to advocate their rights. Capacity was certainly one of the qualifications for a member of Parliament, but capacity might be employed in the wrong way as well as in the right. Great talents had done more harm than good in the history of this country; and the great quality necessary, above all, was, the resolution to speak the sentiments of their constituency honestly, or, if they could not do so, consistently with their own opinions, to resign their seats.

Mr. Baring declared that the measure now proposed, was not a reform of the manner in which the House was elected, but was, in fact, a new constitution. Ministers might say that the old constitution was worn out, that it worked ill, that it had produced among the people misery and discontent, to which they would no longer submit, and must therefore be remodelled on new principles. This would be intelligible; it would be calling things by their right name. But sure he was, that what the government now presented as a measure of Reform, was as essentially a new constitution, as if it had come fresh from the pigeon-holes of the Abbé Sieyès. During a long course in Parliament, he had been known by his principles to be almost a party man attached to the men who at present formed the government, from his high opinion of their characters, and



his belief in the sincerity of their intentions ; but, fond of liberty as he was—and he had been as constant and as warm a friend of liberty as any man in that house—no consideration could induce him to support the measure which that government had now proposed for the adoption of the legislature.

We possessed a constitution, in which, he would not say by the wisdom of our ancestors, but by a long course of accidental circumstances, which might be more properly called the gifts of Providence, improvement had been going on from its earliest existence, through all its subsequent changes, until it had acquired that state which made it the envy of the world, and, as he had been accustomed to believe, until of late years, the pride and glory of the people of this country. He had been taught that this constitution consisted of three estates—King, Lords, and Commons. Pass this bill, and you must reverse the order : you will have a constitution consisting of Commons, Lords, and King. Under the constitution, so long as it had existed, the contents of the House of Commons had formed a popular representation, arising, indeed, from varied materials, but essentially representing the popular interests of the country. So long as the Constitution had existed, they had had in the House of Commons the influence of the popular body, mixed up with much of the influence of the Crown, and much of the influence of the aristocracy, with the influence of property, of the clergy, and of all the varied interests of which the public body is composed. But the principle now inculcated was, let the Crown keep to itself, let the peers keep to themselves, and let the people have

the House of Commons to themselves. That might be, in the opinion of ministers, something better than the constitution, but assuredly it was not, and never had been, the constitution ; it was not that constitution which had brought us through three centuries of progressive freedom and prosperity. He knew well that it was very easy for shallow minds to find, in this mixed representation, defects and imperfections at which to point their scoffing and sarcasm ; but, if all the constitution-mongers in the world had never been able to set up one, under which any thing approaching to the same degree of rational liberty, of order, and of happiness, had been enjoyed by the community, then he felt himself warranted in saying, that there was something in the forming such a constitution, above the reach of any body of men, and depending on accident alone ; and if we had been so favoured as to have such a jewel placed in our possession, let neither the clamours of demagogues, nor the vain and self-satisfied fancies of constitution-makers, induce us “to throw a pearl away, richer than all their tribe.”

What were the practical objections to the existence of this mixed representation in the House of Commons ? Had the peers been interfering to restrain or lessen the freedom of speech, or to take from them any of the privileges they had formerly possessed ? Had the peers been exercising their influence to oppress them, and to pass laws for their own exclusive advantage against the interests of other classes ? He knew of no such thing. On the contrary, while the mixture of aristocratic and popular influence in that House



had been the greatest promoter of just and equal laws; he knew of no oppression or grievance which had sprung from their union. Was popular influence losing its weight in the House by the increase of other influences? No; the House of Commons now responded to the popular wishes more than at any other period since its existence. The popular feeling was never more truly represented there than at the present moment. There had been of late much restlessness abroad, and the spirit had extended itself to the people of this country; and let him ask whether that feeling of the public had not shown itself in that House? The people did not know much what they wanted, and he believed that House knew as little what it would have. It turned out one ministry and chose another, and was not, perhaps, very much disposed to support either. The existing representation was one upon which the opinions of the people did duly act. No difficulty could arise to any interest in the country—no branch of trade or manufacture suffered a temporary depression—but committees were set afloat, and applications were forthwith made to the government and to the House; and he would venture to assert, that never were the distresses of the people, under any form of government whatever, considered with more parental feeling and anxiety to afford them relief. This had been the state of the representation, and these had been its effects. Formerly, they had been appreciated and beloved by all Englishmen. But it seemed that new lights had broken in upon them, and what his hon. friends now proposed was, that the whole influence of the aristocracy in the

representation should go. The principle of these market-place reformers was, that the present constitution of the House was illegal; that the influence of the peers, their nominations, and their patronage, were all good for nothing, and must be got rid of.

After objecting to the proposed qualification as being greatly too low, especially for counties, and stating that in France, under all the effervescence of the revolution of last year, nobody had thought of going below a sum equal to at least 100*l.* per annum in this country, Mr. Baring (who sat for Callington) said, he could not help observing that lord John Russell had passed over Tavistock, and put his mark upon Callington. He did not know why Callington should be selected more than Tavistock. There had been no corruption in Callington. He had never expended one shilling in his election which he should be unwilling to submit to the inspection of any reforming member of that House. He did not charge his noble friend with partiality; but it was remarkable, that, when Tavistock was on one side, and Callington on the other, Tavistock should escape. He wished to know who drew the line, and why it was drawn? They were both small towns, within ten miles of each other. At the last election, everything was fair. He polled 200 votes, and his election bill amounted to no more than 150*l.* His noble friend said these objectionable boroughs went to the Treasury. He did not know why Callington should go to the Treasury more than Tavistock, or why the duke of Bedford might not direct its two members to the Treasury. There could be no doubt, whatever might



be the fate of the plan proposed by ministers, that Tavistock would still belong to the duke of Bedford. He thought he could ensure the maintenance of the present interest. If his grace the duke of Bedford gave him half-a-crown, he would ensure the noble duke the return of two members for Tavistock, and both should be in the interest of the house of Russell.

Lord Palmerston, a disciple of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson, followed in defence of the ministry and their bill. He admitted that, however important had been the subjects which had heretofore been submitted to the attention of the House, there never had been one of so great importance, and involving so many difficulties, as the present. Measures heretofore brought forward had been single measures, the consequences of which might be judged of from past experience; but the present was one which could not be tried upon such guesses; it was one which must be influential on the character of the government and the people to all future time, and one which would have a direct influence upon the existence of the empire. He had no wish to dissemble its importance, or to attempt to underrate it; for so to do would be to declare his incompetence to judge upon a proposition which went to make a material change in a constitution that had so long been productive of great benefit to the country. A love of change was no part of the character of the people of England; on the contrary, they were remarkable for their tenacious adherence to old institutions. When, therefore, the public mind called for a change, and that not suddenly, but at the calm and steady instance of

those whose property and station put them in a position to judge wisely, then, he would say, there must exist some evil, for which it became the serious duty of Parliament to find a remedy. Now, in point of fact, public opinion did call for a change in the Constitution; and, for proof of this, he need merely refer to himself and his colleagues now sitting as ministers on the benches so recently occupied by the present opposition. It was his firm opinion, that nothing but the unbending notions of a few men in power, on the subject of Reform, had been fatal to the late ministry.

The present measure was said to go too far—to be pregnant with danger; and those who had formerly proposed, or supported, more partial measures, were now taunted with extravagance and inconsistency. But he would tell such persons that, if they foreboded danger, it became them, three years ago, to have looked forward to the consequences of resisting those moderate and necessary reforms, which, at that period more particularly, lay within their power. If they had convicted the corrupt boroughs which were then brought under the cognizance of the House—if government, admitting the principle, had agreed to carry it further, as circumstances might arise, and had transferred the franchise to large manufacturing towns, the more general reform now introduced would not have become necessary. He had supported these measures because he thought them good in themselves, and because he was convinced that such a mode of proceeding would have afforded well-grounded hopes of seeing the franchise conferred in time on all large manufacturing



towns, as well as on counties not sufficiently represented. His predictions, at that time, were condemned by the members opposite, for the same reasons for which they now condemned the present measure; and he could only say in return, that he supported that limited proposition for the same reason for which he now supported the more extensive measure introduced by the government.

As to that measure itself, the more it was examined, the more it would be found to apply a sound and safe remedy to the points in which the existing representation was defective, and these were, that a single individual could return members—that the grossest corruption prevailed both in great and in small boroughs—that manufacturing and trading towns had no representatives—that elections were expensive—that the franchise was unequally distributed among the middle classes. That nomination boroughs had their partial advantages by giving seats to persons of splendid talent and great capacity, who could not otherwise have got in; and that they had not injured popular interests, as many of the individuals returned for such boroughs had been the champions of popular rights, might be very true; but the question was, how can you provide for large towns without disfranchising boroughs? It seemed to be admitted on the other side that the large manufacturing towns ought to be brought in; but room could not be made for them, unless the smaller boroughs were excluded—for the House, as it now existed, was already too numerous for business. It had been insinuated, if not openly stated, that the line between the boroughs to be disfranchised, and

those to be preserved, had been so drawn as to preserve the influence of some particular party, and Tavistock had been pointed at as having suspiciously escaped proscription. Whoever could seriously believe that any such partial considerations had been regarded, only shewed that his views on the question were not entitled to much weight. It was necessary to draw a line somewhere, and the difficulty was to determine what point of population it ought to pass through—neither was it true that the bill was founded merely on population. Population had been adopted to ascertain what places ought to send members; but, among the population of these places, it was property which regulated the distribution of the franchise; and the effect of the plan would be, to extend the franchise to the great body of respectable householders, who had an interest in preserving the institutions of the country. Instead of separating the respectable and intelligent classes of society from the aristocracy, it would unite them, while it would likewise form a bond between the former and the government. He would not deny that the House, as at present constituted, contained much intelligence and ability; but still it was not that House of Commons which the people of England wished, nor that which they would be most likely to regard with respect. If there were any classes who required more than others proper representation, they were the inhabitants of large manufacturing towns; they needed representatives who understood their interests, and who might be ready to watch over them. For this purpose the government had proposed to give thirty-six members to the manufacturing towns;



and because this was done, a cry was raised that the system was destroyed. But how could such an assertion bear a hearing, when it was known that, to counter-balance this, fifty-five members had been added to the counties, and that those who voted for towns were to have no vote for the county members? The landed interest well merited this consideration, and he looked upon it as the basis on which the best interests of society and the sacred institutions of the country rested. In making this observation, he meant no disparagement to the manufacturing and trading community, because, he was well aware that wherever there was property, there must be a co-existing interest in the institutions of the country. The tendency of the bill, too, to prevent corruption was obvious. The present mode of election was the most offensive and disgusting that could be imagined. At a general election, a third man was always wanted; but 10*l.* or 12*l.* a-head must be paid, one half down, and the other at the close of the election. This species of abuse was chiefly practised by the non-resident voters; and by doing away with that class, the evil would at least be diminished. Electors, again, in most cases, consulted not so much the fitness of the candidates as the length of their purses. The man who, whatever were his endowments, could not pay his agents, his houses, and post-horse charges, till the fourteenth day, was obliged to retire. This evil the bill would remedy by shortening the duration of elections, and empowering voters to poll at different places at the same time.

Sir Robert Peel, who was now loudly called for, said that he came

to the consideration of the tremendous subject before the House, with feelings of pain and humiliation beyond any thing he had ever experienced in considering a question of this description. He was asked to adopt a new constitution, and he was not asked to do this, after a calm and dispassionate inquiry, but was called upon to take this hasty step by an appeal to motives, to act on which would be subjecting his judgment to his fears, instead of controlling his fears by his judgment. Why had the king's name been introduced? Why had it been stated in another place that this plan had received the particular sanction of the king? Was it necessary, day after day, to state in both Houses of parliament, and from the public press, that this measure was brought forward with his majesty's express sanction? He held it to be no imputation upon his respect and loyalty to the crown, if he disregarded the intimation that the king had stamped the measure with the royal approbation; and if, as a member of parliament, he exercised his judgment on the merits of the question as unreservedly as if no such intimation had been obtruded upon them day after day. Then the House was menaced with dissolution—an event equally probable if the measure were carried. But he cared not whether the House were dissolved or not, and he would be unfit for the performance of a single legislative duty, if he permitted any such menace to influence him. He cared not whether he was returned again or not; but if he felt any anxiety on that head, he would go to his constituents with this bill in his hand, and would plead special claims to their



renewed confidence in his determined opposition to it. He would tell them that the bill had been brought in to deprive them of their constitutional privileges, without any allegation of necessity, without any case being made out against them, and that he had opposed it. He knew they had never abused their rights—that the humblest man amongst them had never asked or received a bribe—and, till the necessity of the measure was established by more cogent arguments than he had yet heard, he would never consent to deprive them of rights which the constitution gave them, and which they had innocently and honestly exercised.

But he was told that he must adopt the new constitution as the only alternative to prevent civil commotion: he was to be scared from the exercise of his deliberate judgment on a peculiarly complex and important question, by the apprehension of a threatened massacre. If it was so—which no man who knew the people of England could believe—let those answer for it, who had preferred manifesting their ability to destroy, rather than their capacity to govern. “I, at least, am not one who has industriously laboured to excite the stormy multitude, and employed all his faculties to foster discontent. I, at least, have never uttered the language used by a noble lord in 1827, who found the people peaceful, quiet, and contented, and complained that he could not rouse their indignation against the House of Commons, and grieved that they were so apathetic as to be deaf to the voice of the charmer, charm he never so wisely. I, at least, have never called for a list of privy councillors, in order to

direct against them the torrent of popular resentment on account of the remuneration which they received for their services. I have never encouraged any body of men to display, under the very eyes of the government, a foreign emblem of revolution. I have never been the person to excite the people to phrensy, or to spur on their lazy indifference to an emulous competition in revolutionary clamour. If, therefore, this extraordinary measure, which common prudence would have forborne to introduce at such a crisis of our foreign and domestic relations, when every fresh cause of excitement ought to have been studiously avoided—if it should be defeated, I shall never allow that any responsibility for the consequences attaches to myself or to those who have thought and acted like me.”

Sir Robert went on to say that he must repeat the question, to which no answer had yet been given by the other side; what practical evils has the constitution inflicted on the country, to render it deserving of a sentence of proscription. If the constitution as it existed, existed exclusively for the benefit of those whom it was the fashion to term borough-mongers, and if in them only all its benefits centered, argument in its defence would be nugatory; but no such assertion could be ventured, and it would not be difficult to make a calm and temperate appeal to the people of England on behalf of their old English constitution. It was in vain to say that this or that particular part appeared to answer no rational end. The question was, what mischief has it done, and what is its action as a part of the whole? Who would pretend to



judge of the symmetry and proportions of the human frame, of its organs, faculties, and endowments, which fell so little short of angelic existence itself, by merely examining an isolated member or detached feature of the fabric when perfect as created? It was the form of government to which all ancient wisdom, and all modern experience had borne testimony, and of which all that wisdom and all that experience proved, that no sagacity, of any one body of men, could bring it into existence. The House had already heard stated the opinions of our most distinguished modern statesmen; but one still remained to be adduced, and that one was the noble mover himself of the present bill. In the session of 1819, that noble lord, when speaking on the disfranchisement of a corrupt borough in Cornwall, had said, that he would consider a general disfranchisement of the unconvicted boroughs as a re-construction of the House of Commons altogether, and he went on thus:—"Old Sarum had existed when Montesquieu pronounced the constitution of England the nearest to perfection of any which the most enlightened states had ever before experienced. When lord Somers, and the other great legislators and philosophers who flourished with him, bore attestation to its merits, it was open to the same objections which were since urged against it; and when Hampden lost his life, Rutland returned the same number of representatives as Yorkshire. He was not inclined, with the pseudo merchant in the fable, to cry, "new lamps for old," and would not consent to exchange the instrument which had created so much national prosperity for a burnished and

tinselled article of modern manufacture. Neither would he willingly throw our political system into the wheel on the chance of obtaining a prize in the lottery of constitutions." Such had been the noble lord's judicious, and, at the present moment, seasonable warning against the danger of rashly departing from the practical wisdom of mankind during centuries of historical experience—proffered, too, at the critical juncture of the year 1819, when the Six Acts had passed, when the seizure of arms bill, the blasphemous libel bill, and the newspaper stamp bill, were in actual progress through the House. If such was the line of argument of the noble lord in 1819, he, in his lordship's language, would now call upon the House to prefer the solid ancient lamp of the constitution to the tinsel of modern sophistry.

Looking at such opinions as contrasted with the proposed bill, he declared that he could see in the latter only the instrument of men endeavouring to retain power. If ministers had felt it necessary to propose a safe and moderate measure of reform of some branches of our representation, he would most probably have acted on the views taken by some other members, of the danger to be apprehended from all resistance to change, and have given it his support as a private individual, though he might not have thought it fit to originate it in an official capacity. He would not have objected to a measure for extending the elective franchise to some places not at present possessing it. But he could not consent to a measure, which, in the words of its very mover, went to reconstruct that House; and, be the consequences what they might, so wholly did he



despair of being able to modify the noble lord's bill into a kind of moderate measure less objectionable, that he would oppose the plan altogether. And why would he act thus? Because, having attentively listened to the noble mover's statement, and to all that had been subsequently said for and against it, he felt convinced that if the noble lord's argument was good for any thing, the measure which he then proposed could not be a final one, but a mere precedent to still more dangerous innovations. The noble lord had told them that he found the ancient constitution of this country in 25 Edward I., and in the statute *de tallagio non concedendo*. But what did these statutes express? Simply that "taxes should not be levied without the consent of the commonalty of the realm." And then, argued the noble lord, if reform be a question of right, which he held it to be, here was the right anciently established. If this were the right principle of the case, how far had the proposer of this bill consulted it, when he proposed to disfranchise so many thousands of those upon whom taxes are levied? Did he assume that the law admitted of such a distinction? It did not; yet he would at once disfranchise all tax payers rated under 10*l*. How could he justify this his distinction, particularly upon his own premises? Where was there here any regard to principle and right?

But practical consequences were still more important than abstract principles; and one of the worst things about this bill was, its inevitable tendency to sever every link of connexion between the poorer classes, and that class from which representatives were commonly chosen. The great characteristic

feature, and the practical working of the present system of representation was, that it enabled every class in the community to have a voice, in some way or other, in the election of the members of that House. He did not mean to say that the franchise should be extended to all the members of all the classes of the community, but that the constitution worked well from having here and there an entrance channel for the broadest principle of popular representation. If it was proposed to him to make a selection between the franchise in force in Windsor and that in force in Preston, he would not hesitate to prefer the former; but he would not therefore abolish the Preston franchise and assimilate it to that in Windsor: all that he would do was to take care not to take it as the model for his plan of extending the franchise to other places; but not so the present bill. It would disfranchise all those open boroughs, the voters of which were not rated at 10*l*., though no reason had been, or could be, adduced for depriving the freemen of Coventry, or the pot-walloppers of Preston, of their franchise. Would not, he put it to the noble lord and the House, the effect of this disqualifying principle be the affixing a political stigma upon those not eligible to vote under the 10*l*. qualification? He could not consent to the measure, were it only on this ground; for he could not consent to a stigma upon from 200 to 300 of his constituents whom the bill would disfranchise; to be left, forsooth, to a privy council arrangement by which others might possibly be enabled to vote from an adjoining parish. Lord Palmerston had talked much of the great check which would be



given to corruption by disfranchising non-resident voters; yet his lordship represented the University of Cambridge, and what would his non-resident constituents say to such an arrangement? [Here it was intimated across the House, that this provision would not be applied to the universities, on which sir R. Peel exclaimed] “No! what! is this their general rule that has no exception? the reason, the peculiar beauty of which is, that it applies unflinchingly and without exception to all classes and places. What does it do? It makes an exception of a body—the clergy, the very men who least need being made an exception; while it deprives the less protected poor man of the privilege of voting, where he does not possess a house rated at 10*l*.”

To the convincing fact, that the close boroughs were advantageous, by bringing in men who had nothing but ability to recommend them, nothing like an answer had yet been given, though two had been attempted. The answer of Mr. Hobhouse was, that it was not desirable that men of splendid talents should be members of that House—that in a reformed parliament solid sense and integrity would be more highly valued. Now, on the other hand, he maintained, nothing tended more to foster the public respect for that House than its being the great arena of talent and eloquence, and that nothing would lower it more in public estimation than that it should be below the average ability of educated gentlemen. Mr. Macaulay, again, argued that the introduction of able and useful men was only an accident, and you must judge of the fitness of institutions, not by their accidents, but by their tendencies. Now, he was content

to judge by the tendency, and not by the accident, of the close borough system, and would maintain that the tendency was essentially favourable to the entrance of men of ability into that House. He had that morning turned over the names of from twenty to twenty-five of the most distinguished men that had graced that house for the last thirty or forty years; and he found that, with three exceptions, they were all returned for boroughs which the present bill would wholly disfranchise. There was Mr. Dunning, lord North, J. Townsend, Mr. Burke, Mr. Flood,\* Mr. Pitt, Mr. Fox, lord Granville, the marquis Wellesley, Mr. Percival, lord Plunkett, Mr. Canning, Mr. Windham, Mr. Horner, Mr. Huskisson, Mr. Brougham, sir S. Romilly, lord Castlereagh, Mr. Tierney, sir W. Grant, lord Grey, and the late lord Liverpool—all first returned for close boroughs, and but three of them ever members for counties. Nor was the mere facility of admission the only benefit. The introduction, by affording them an opportunity of displaying their legislative ability, recommended them, at a more mature age, to places enjoying a more extensive franchise; and when, again, from caprice, from the loss of popularity—a loss so easily, and how often most honourably incurred—they were deprived of these latter seats, the close boroughs secured to the country the continuance of their invaluable services. Burke had been repelled from Bristol, to take refuge in Malton; when Sheridan was defeated at Stafford, he found shelter at Ilchester; Mr. Windham, having failed at Norwich, sat for Higham Ferrers. Lord Castlereagh lost his election in the county of Down, and was re-



turned for Oxford. Mr. Tierney, when he lost Southwark, was returned for Knaresborough; and lord Grey for Tavistock, when defeated in Northumberland. And yet this system, working so advantageously for the public weal, so fostering of talent and statesman-like ability, was to be destroyed for the sake of a new theory and an untried experiment!

Against these untried theories, we had long experience of the constitution as it is, and in what respect had it failed to attain all the desirable ends of good government? It had been in force, in its present form, for a century and a half, and he had not yet found a man bold enough to declare that the experience of history had produced any form of government, so calculated to promote the happiness, to secure the rights and liberties, to foster all that ought to be the boast and glory of a free and enlightened people. Many other experiments had been tried to engraft democratical upon monarchical institutions. In France, in Spain, in Portugal, in the Netherlands, in almost every country, the experiment had been tried of uniting democracy with monarchy, and in all of them it had signally failed. In England alone had that mixed constitution succeeded. During the last 150 years, England, under its protection, had stood the shock of a disputed succession—of long wars—of almost every evil that could befall a state. During that period, every other country in Europe had suffered invasion—had submitted to a change of dynasty, or been compelled to bow the neck to a foreign power. England, by the free hearts which her constitution alone created and encouraged, had stood untouched. Did not all

history teach us, that the great danger of great nations was the danger of a successful military chieftain attaching to himself the affections of his legions, and being misled by vanity to turn the arms, which he had first employed for the defence of his country, to his own ambition and aggrandizement. Had not the present constitution of England saved it, for more than a century and a half of military glory, from that unfortunate accident? The staff of Marlborough, the greatest chieftain of his age, had been broken in this country with impunity; and had not the baton of the duke of Wellington, the most illustrious commander of the present age, before whose culminating star even the fortunes of Napoleon had quailed—had not that baton crumbled into atoms before the vote of that very House? All this had been done by the constitution which we enjoyed: it had served all the purposes of government, as no constitution had ever done; and, up to the present moment, no one practical advantage had been held out as the natural result of the proposed change. All the reasons which had been urged to the House centered in this, that it was necessary to conciliate public opinion. No better way, it seemed, of conciliating public opinion could be devised than increasing the constituency of the country by half a million of electors. Well, then, if another government, equally anxious to participate in the favour of what was made the public, should propose to add another half million, their argument must be entitled to the same success. Formerly, when reform was proposed, some practical tangible gain was promised; now no such consequence was proclaimed. We used to be promised that, when-



the constitution of the House of Commons should undergo a change, securities could be taken to prevent it from engaging us in ruinous wars. All persons who knew any thing of history were well aware that, of all governments, popular governments were the most warlike. Mr. Fox had left it on record, that the American war was highly popular at its commencement. At a later period, it had been asserted by other statesmen, inferior only to him, that all the wars, in which we had been subsequently engaged, were popular at their outset, but had lost the favour of the people on the first appearance of failure. We used to be told, that retrenchment of the expenditure would be the first step of a reformed parliament; but now this reforming government itself had already declared that farther retrenchment was impossible. We used also to be told, that reform was necessary to check the enormous power of the crown in the House of Commons. That, too, was no longer repeated—and with good reason. Would any member venture to state it as his grave opinion that any influence could successfully contend in that House with the influence of public opinion?

And what was, in truth, the character of those public wishes which were to be gratified even by the destruction of the constitution? If members would only look at the history of the reform question, they would find that it was the mere plaything of foreign example, or domestic distress, and that whenever it was much agitated, some dire misfortune lurked behind. It came forth with great pomp of circumstance in the year of rebellion

of 1745; it was brought prominently forward during the American war; it was brought forward at the commencement of the French war; and, to come to our own times, it was brought prominently forward in the years 1817, 1819, and 1822; in a word, at every period when there was either great commercial or great agricultural distress in the country, reform was brought conspicuously forward, and was certain to find favour in the eyes of the people. It was brought forward, too, at periods when the excitement of foreign revolutions misled the judgment of the British public, and, deluding them with a false love of liberty, rendered them discontented with the moderate freedom which they enjoyed. Mr. Pitt was its advocate and champion in 1780, when the establishment of American independence, after a successful struggle with this country, had deluded the enthusiastic lovers of freedom with notions of liberty which it was difficult to comprehend. From the year 1785 to the year 1790, the question of reform slept in lethargy like that of the grave; but in the latter year the appalling events of the French revolution recalled it into life, and inspired it with new power. When the present lord Durham brought it forward in the year 1821, he appealed to the events which then had just taken place in Spain, as the dawn of liberty over this benighted country. Again, with the events of the last French revolution fresh in the recollection of the country, he had no hesitation in saying, that the same experiment was again in agitation, and the country was again expecting that it could improve its own liberty from the ex-



ample of what had recently passed in France. "Oh! let us wait until we see the result of that experiment, for it is proper that we should pause before we make it in our own happy country. Before we venture upon it, let us feel assured that the liberty, which now exists in France, if it be the offspring of a just revolution, is that liberty which has justice and virtue as its companions, and peace and prosperity as its attendants. I see at present no reasons for expecting such consequences to emanate from the late revolution in France, and I deprecate, above all things, making the revolution in France a precedent for a revolution in this country. Let us, therefore, remain content with the well-tempered freedom which we now enjoy, and which we have the means of securing, if we act with ordinary discretion. I lament exceedingly that government should have determined to agitate such a question as that of reform at this particular crisis; it would have been wiser, in my opinion, to have avoided these new causes of excitement, for, depend upon it, that by this process throughout this land the first seeds of discontent and disunion are sown. In every town there will be a conflict—a moral conflict, I mean—between the possessors of existing authority and existing privileges, and those to whom the existing authority and the existing privileges are to be transferred. Oh! sir, I lament beyond measure that government had not the prudence to adhere to that temperate course of policy which they have pursued elsewhere. I lament that, if they did think it necessary to propose a plan of reform in this excited state of the

public mind, they did not confine it within those narrow limits which are consistent with the safety of the country, and the dignity of their own characters. They have thought proper, however, to adopt another course: they have sent through the land the fire-brand of agitation: and it is easy so far to imitate the giant enemy of the Philistines, as to send fire-brands through the country, carrying danger and dismay in all quarters; but it is not easy, when the mischief is done, to find a remedy. In the present difficulties of your situation, you should take care that you do not signalize your own destruction by bowing down the pillars of the edifice of your liberty, which, with all its imperfections, still contains the noblest society of freemen known to the habitable world."

Mr. Duncombe said, he was one of those who had taken part in putting in the present ministers; and he had been desirous to afford them his utmost support, and to stand by them, especially in any rational and practical reform. But no friendly feelings which he might entertain towards them could ever justify him in supporting them in a bill like this, which was revolutionary as regarded the constitution, insulting as regarded the House, unprincipled, partial, and oppressive as regarded the country. Mr. John Smith, although proprietor of the borough of Midhurst, declared, that when the proposed measure was first explained to the House, "it almost took away his breath, so much had he been delighted with it;" and if any member would move the disfranchisement of Midhurst, he would give him his cordial support.

Mr. Calcraft had been thought



a pretty good reformer, but now found himself "a puny whipster." He had often expressed his opinion, he said, that the present system did not work well; but he was sure that the new one would work a great deal worse. He had been prepared, before the measure was opened, to support ministers in their reform, never imagining it possible that they could fall upon what they were now attempting; and the present difference between him and them was this, that he was for reform, and they were for revolution. He never would agree to a measure which would render the legislature the mere slave of popular opinion, and enable one estate to destroy the others. If this bill were passed, they might depend upon it that the change would not stop where the government wished it to stop: the end would be, that they must convert the monarchy into a republic.

Mr. Stanley, secretary for Ireland, the most adroit debater whom ministers had to fight their battle in the lower House, maintained that it was a mere abuse of words to call the measure a revolution. The distinction between the word "revolution" and the phrase "new constitution," meaning thereby a new constitution of the Commons house of parliament, was very evident. By revolution, he understood a great change effected in the constitution of a country by the application of unconstitutional force. The very lowest and mildest sense in which it could be used was, the infringement, by the exercise of power by one class of the community, of the rights belonging to another. But what was the case here? Ministers proposed an alteration with respect to one estate of the

realm. The plan was to be canvassed in all its parts: it was subjected to the control of public opinion; it must be submitted to the other two estates of the realm; and yet, forsooth, this was called revolution. At every turn, too, ministers had been met with the cry, that they wished to carry this measure by intimidation. But surely it was allowable to advert to the state of the country as a collateral argument, to relieve the timid and hesitating from their doubts, and clearly pointing out to them whence the greater danger was to be apprehended,—from the refusal or from the concession of reform. For this there was the authority of sir Robert Peel himself, who, when arguing in favour of the late Catholic bill, spoke thus: "We have also had the experience of civil discord and bloodshed. Surely it is no unmanly fear that shudders at its recurrence—no degenerate impulse that prompts one to exclaim with lord Falkland, Peace! peace! peace!—that looks out with anxiety for the alternatives by which civil war may be honourably averted, which may rescue the natives of the same land, the fellow-subjects of the same king, from the dire necessity of embruing their hands in each other's blood." Now, he asked the House, whether, in the course of this debate, there had been made so direct and strong an appeal as to the danger which might result from the refusal of this great and healing measure which he had introduced? That right hon. baronet had likewise complained that the measure was brought forward at an unfortunate and unfitting season. But ministers had come in upon the pledge that they would introduce a measure of reform. If, with



this pledge upon their lips, they had told the people, as soon as they found themselves seated in office, that this was no convenient time for reform; then, indeed, would have rested upon them the fearful responsibility of the consequences arising from disappointed hopes, and of high-raised expectations, blighted and falsified by the mean conduct of those upon whom the people had relied. Procrastination in such matters was always mischievous. All these cases of tardy political concession were like the old Sybilline books—the longer you delay the purchase, the higher is the price you must pay, and the less the advantage you receive. By selecting, one after another, the most notorious cases of delinquency, not as technically proved, but those great cases in regard to which moral conviction prevailed, though legal evidence could not reach them, they might have shewn a desire to reform, by degrees, the abuses of the system, and then the public would have been satisfied with a less sudden change, than was now contemplated. But let the House look back on the few last years, and mark the time, the money; and the talent which had been wasted in discussing useless questions regarding boroughs charged with malpractices—inquiring, for instance, whether one voter received one guinea, and another five, when it was notorious that boroughs were bought and sold by their proprietors. And after all this labour and minute inquiry, what had been gained for the cause of reform? Not one great town, not one great district had been added to those represented in that House: not one corrupt borough had been deprived of the means of

corruption. The opponents of the present measure said, We don't object to the disfranchisement of delinquent boroughs: prove corruption, and we shall give them up. But how was it possible for the ingenuity of man to discover delinquency in the wall at Midhurst, or detect corruption in the green mound at Old Sarum? If delinquency were to be the rule of cashiering, as it had been called, how was the disfranchisement of the Irish 40s. freeholders to be defended? He agreed that that disfranchisement was a beneficial measure; but still the 40s. freeholders had been guilty of no delinquency. Their franchise had been taken from them, not on account of any delinquency of theirs, but because the right, while nominally exercised by the many, was really wielded by the few for their own purposes. Why not make a beneficial change on the franchise in England, as much as in Ireland? and it was to be observed, that the new proposed qualification of 10% was the very qualification which the former ministry had introduced into Ireland, with this difference, that, under the present bill, no man would be deprived, during his life, of the franchise which he now enjoyed.

As to the accusation that the bill was a robbing and despoiling of the corporations, it had already been sufficiently disposed of; and he would only add, that it was strange to hear such charges coming from men with whom Mr. Pitt was the great authority, considering how distinctly Mr. Pitt had maintained that boroughs ought to be disfranchised and enfranchised as they decayed or rose into importance. In one of his



speeches on parliamentary reform, Mr. Pitt, adverting to the earlier periods of the constitution, observed, "that as one borough decayed and another rose, the franchise of the one was abolished, and the other was invested with the right. That the same system should still prevail, but that it should be rescued from the accident and caprice in which it had before been involved; that the alteration should be made on principle; and that they should establish this as a clear axiom in representation—that it should depend, not upon locality or name, but upon number and condition. He would submit to the world which of the two was most anxious for the preservation of the original principle of the constitution; he who was for maintaining the exterior name of representation, when the substance was gone, or he, who, preferring the substance and reality of representation to the name and exterior, was solicitous of changing its seat from one part of the country to another, as one place might flourish and another decay.

This ought likewise to be a sufficient answer to the fears of those who apprehended from the bill the destruction of the proper influence of the aristocracy. Were the present ministers the men who could possibly be suspected of a wish to strike down the aristocracy? Was he himself likely to be a party to such a scheme? Was the noble lord who had introduced the measure to the house a man without any stake in the country? Was not the name he bore, in itself a guarantee against any such intention? Was the noble earl at the head of the government—one said to be strenuously attached to the privileges of

his order—and who had on more than one occasion, been made the object of attack on that ground—was he likely to advocate a measure which was to involve those privileges, along with the monarchy, in one common ruin? Look round at the other members of his majesty's government, and those who had come forward to support them on this occasion; were they men of no fortune, mere adventurers, who would have every thing to gain and nothing to lose by a revolution? Or were they not men who had large stakes in the country, and whose individual interests were bound up with the permanent peace and security of the state? What, then, could they gain by a revolution? Their object was the promotion of the true interests of the country. For his own part, he felt no alarms of the kind for the results of the bill. By that bill would be upheld the influence of the aristocracy as it was before—he meant that legitimate influence which they ought to possess—the influence which it was always within their power to secure—the natural influence of property—the influence arising from that respect to high rank which was nowhere greater than in this country—the influence of affection generated by kindness and good offices to those around them.

Mr. C. Wynn, likewise a member of the government, said that, when he accepted office, he did so, although convinced of the necessity of reform, only on the understanding that he should be at liberty to hold and maintain his own opinions as to any particular measure of reform which the cabinet might propose. He now found that in the proposed bill, while there was



much which he approved, there was likewise much from which he must dissent. In its present form he could not support it, nor could he expect that such modifications would be made in it as would meet his views. He was aware that a member of a government differing materially on an important measure from the administration to which he belonged, could not expect to remain long in office; but he had acted conscientiously, and was ready to take the consequences.

Mr. Jeffrey, who had been appointed by the new ministry Lord Advocate of Scotland, next addressed himself to the question. The European reputation which this gentleman had long enjoyed as the editor of the *Edinburgh Review*, and the author of many articles displaying great acuteness of thought, and the happiest felicities of expression, joined to the more popular and business talents of skill and oratory, which had raised him to the undisputed leadership of the bar of Scotland, had rendered his maiden speech in parliament a subject of considerable expectation. Although by his office he was more particularly charged with the bill which was to remodel the representation of Scotland, he very prudently abstained from attempting to engage the House in a matter which would much less interest it than the general principles applicable to England, in the discussion of which it had hitherto been engaged. The constantly repeated assertion, that the present system ought not to be changed, because the country had prospered under it was, he said, a mere paralogism. The country had prospered under the

government of the Tudors and the Stewarts; but who would maintain that it ought therefore to have remained satisfied with the civil liberties which it then enjoyed? Political freedom was the daughter, and not the mother of wealth. How had the Italian republics, and the free towns of Germany arisen? At their outset, as in all European communities which had prospered, absolute rulers had bestowed some privileges on the honey-bees of the hives, whose combs they found useful. Under these privileges, industry had brought wealth; wealth had brought influence; and in the end, despotic power had been cast aside, and political liberty had been established. This country had been prosperous and splendid, while saddled with the star chamber, with purveyance, and with ship-money. At that time there were merchants of great opulence; men of honour and intelligence; immortal works of genius were then composed, as now; England then bore as proud a name among other nations as at any other period. But, as wealth multiplied, intelligence appeared to spread among the population; and, in the same proportion, the basis on which the constitution rested was widened, to provide room for the multiplied children of freedom. We all knew how, in feudal times, the barons extorted charters from the sovereign, and how towns were taken under the protecting wings of the barons or sovereigns, to give strength to the one or to the other of these parties. Then came the burgesses, gradually rising into wealth; and, last of all, the serfs and villains were emancipated. Where was the man who would say that, at any of those periods,



concession ought to have stopped short? By what criterion could a judgment be formed as to the point beyond which it would be impossible to go without ruin? He knew no limits to improvement, except the limits to the desires of intelligent men, craving, and rendering reasons for craving more, or the want of those arguments by which their desires must be defended and explained? Now, was it true or not, that, within the last thirty years, there had been manifested among the people a great capacity to understand, and intelligence to comprehend, civil rights and obligations, compared with which all that had existed in the most glorious days of our former history was insignificant? Look to the greater number of persons of wealth, intelligence, and respectability belonging to the middle ranks who were now unrepresented. Was it true, in point of fact, that that great body of citizens was discontented, and alienated from a system which excluded them? The answer to that question was to be found in the petitions already on the table in favour of reform, signed by hundreds of thousands, while the only petition he could find on the other side was one from Bristol, mimicking the language of the iron barons of Merton "we wish not the laws of England to be changed."

Much had been said of the advantage conferred by the present system in so far as the hereditary aristocracy and the democracy were beneficially blended in the House of Commons. Now he conceived, in the first place, that the hereditary aristocracy, in their individual capacity, possessed no prerogatives or privileges at all, except that of being hereditary legislators

and magistrates, and these privileges they could not exercise anywhere but in their own house. But even of the peers, it was only the rich proprietors who enjoyed this influence in the lower House: peers who had no boroughs had no such influence. This influence, therefore, did not belong to the peerage; it belonged merely to wealth. Wealth, again, undoubtedly ought to possess influence; but were all wealthy persons proprietors of boroughs? Were the landed and mercantile interests possessed of this influence? A man of small property might lay out his money in this way, and manage, by the purchase of a borough, to get a kind of stock in trade; but whatever was done in this way ought to be done openly. If it were desirable that peers should have boroughs, as some of them had at present, not because they were peers, but because they were rich men who had laid out their money just as a commoner might do, it would be better to pass an act, that every peer with a certain income should have a member, or, with a certain larger income, a couple of members, in that House. Then there would be insured a proper appendage to their rank, instead of a monopoly conceded to those among them who were wealthy.

In truth, the objections to the proposed measure were singularly contradictory. Some objected to it as too popular and democratic, and yet others objected that it excluded the lower classes. Mr. Hunt called out for a broad, pot-walloping, almost pauper franchise, like that which was in force in his own borough of Preston; while sir R. Peel, in the same breath, condemned the Preston



franchise, and appealed to it as a proof, and as a triumphant boast, that every order of the state was in some way or other represented in that house. To both these, for the nonce auxiliaries, there was the one answer—a true and lasting representative system must have property for its basis; and you must have some minimum standard, by which you can ascertain, whether the individual seeking the possession of the elective franchise has so much permanent property, as will give him an interest in observing the decisions of the legislature. But the qualification was said to be too low. On the contrary, it was increased five-fold; for, at present it was only forty shillings. The 10% qualification, too, comprehended all above 10%, and that might be an hundred or a thousand fold. Was this to inundate the land with a democracy? Really if the 40s. freeholders and the pot-wallopers of the present system did not produce that effect, it was extraordinary how it was to be produced by raising the qualification. Would it be said that a comparatively poor man was less interested in the security of his little property, than the rich man who was dying of ennui, or gloating upon his useless hoards? On the contrary, a man who had acquired a certain degree of competency looked with the greatest anxiety on what affected the security of his property, and was of all others the most likely to rally round the authority by which that property would be defended. He felt himself lifted above that want which he once endured; and though he felt pride in contemplating his own elevation, and his exaltation in the scale of society, he looked down

with affection upon those who were still struggling with adversity. No thinking man, who reflected upon the subject, would contend that the safety of the country rested upon any other basis than a regard for the security of property; and when society was founded upon that basis, the coronet was in no danger of being touched, nor a jewel of the diadem of being soiled. The Lord-Advocate admitted that there were numbers of discontented, whom nothing but destruction would satisfy; but that fact was the strongest possible reason for adopting this measure. There were two classes of disaffected persons in the country. One consisted of industrious persons, in comfortable circumstances, who, though an almost uncountable number, were excluded from what they considered to be their right, and therefore felt vexation and resentment. The second class, from what cause he could not say, perhaps by distress operating upon their passions, perhaps excited by the scenes which had taken place in a neighbouring country, certainly incited by infamous publications, were ready to proceed to greater lengths. There was a set of *doctrinaires*, who were against all law, for they hated law and hated authority, and would plot against them when they could, and would be ready to riot in the licence of disorder. He admitted that there were such men in the country; but would any man tell him that these were the men who petitioned for Reform? Not they; they cared not for Parliamentary Reform; they went far beyond that. They cared nothing for King, for Lords, or for Commons. Their maxim was, every man for himself, and God—or some other



being, whom it would not be seemly to name there—for all. There being then such a set of men in the country, and there being also a body of persons reasonably discontented, the latter had a tendency to graduate into the former; and men, who were only desirous to seek their own just rights, were tempted, by the refusal of those rights, to coalesce with the others, who did all they could to be identified with them. It was only common prudence, therefore, to concede to men who asked nothing whatever but their rights, and thereby segregate them from the others, and not by a refusal, alienate them, and create that just excitement, which would make them listen to those who said that this House was a mockery—that it was confined to creatures of its own—that, whilst it took exorbitant taxes out of the pockets of the people, it would not admit the tax-payers amongst the constituents of the representation. If he was asked what was the evil which the existing system generated, he would say, the evil was the growing and imminent peril of driving a great proportion of the distressed population into excess, by the denial of their just demands, or generating among them feelings of reprobation and contempt. He granted that no reform would satisfy the artfully bad and desperate class. A reasonable reform would not satisfy unreasonable men, but from the very force of the terms, it would satisfy reasonable men; and if the reasonably dissatisfied were made contented, should we not be better able to deal with the unreasonable? The evil was great and imminent; and he wished to draw a firmament between the pure waters above and

the impure surges of corruption below.

To the question, therefore, which had been so often put, what practical good was to result from the intended reform, he would answer at once, that it was the only means of averting the danger he had described, of discontent graduating into disaffection, and disaffection into insurrection. Another advantage of a reformed Parliament would be the great practical influence which it would exercise on the minds of the people in opening their eyes to a conviction of their best interests, and this it would acquire from its affording greater facilities for the conveyance to it of the feelings and wants of the people. He did not mean by this that that House should be a mere echo of the popular will—that its discussions and decisions should be guided by every enthusiasm, indignation, or zeal, of the public mind—but that the public mind should possess a ready audience within its walls. Would any man tell him that such was the case under the present system? Had not abuses been habitually persevered in, on account of the tardy influence which public opinion had on the acts of the legislature? Was it not true that wars had been protracted for years after the people were sick of them, and were pining after peace? Was it not true that a system of official misapplication of the public money had been persevered in, for want of an efficient popular control? Was it not true, that the Slave-trade had been persevered in for years after public opinion had held it up to scorn and indignation? Was it not true that abuses in the Criminal-law were persevered in, till the



feelings of the people, long awake to their enormity, were roused to such a pitch, that a remedy could not be longer withheld? Were not all these facts true of the present system, and were they not incompatible with a reformed Parliament? He was not so absurd as to hold out the reform he was then advocating as the panacea for the ills of the country. By no means; they who thus represented it, and there were such, were mischievous pretenders, if not designing traders in public delusion. But he considered it the essential condition of the future safety and prosperity of the country—one which could not be much longer delayed, and of which every delay was a tenfold aggravation of the evils which all must admit called for remedy. It was worse than idle to say the present cry for Parliamentary Reform was but a temporary ebullition of popular excitement—it was the expression of a long-felt public grievance, to which existing circumstances might communicate a force of tone, but which they could not generate. It was true, that the demand for Reform was usually louder in periods of distress and political excitement, as it was also true that the late memorable transactions in neighbouring states might have added to that excitement. But it was no less true, that the demand for reform was never dead even in the calmest periods, and that, when renewed, it came forth, like a giant after sleep, with increased strength and influence. They had been told, and he believed truly, that had, no later than 1828, the franchise of East Retford been transferred to Birmingham, there would not exist the present excitement with respect to reform.

But, unfortunately for its opponents, that boon had not been granted; and now, the cup being full, a single drop made it overflow.

The House had been told by sir R. Peel, that ministers called on them to surrender their judgments to their fears, instead of their fears to their judgments. Now, in the first place, it was impossible not to see that grave deductions must be made from the judgments of many members who were opposed to the bill. Those who sat for boroughs, which were to be wholly, or partially, disfranchised, were not the most impartial judges of the justice or expediency of that disfranchisement. They had such an interest in the question, that the application of even the strict principles of law would disqualify them from having a voice in its decision. But, farther, said the Lord Advocate, the difference between the right hon. baronet and us is this:—We are afraid of the consequences to the country of denying the people their just rights; they are afraid of the consequences to themselves of granting them. We are afraid not to do justice to the people; they are afraid to do it, lest the doing of justice should produce in the people a perversion of moral feeling. We would grant the people their just demands, were it only to prevent our being compelled, at a later period, to grant them unjust ones; they would perpetuate a system which must end in greater evils than any man can foresee.”

Mr. Croker rose after the Lord Advocate—the Quarterly Review after the Edinburgh. He said, that he could not think it either prudent or parliamentary



in the Lord Advocate, who was no doubt a great legal authority, to lay it down, that even the strict rules of the courts of law would exclude from this discussion the majority of the opponents of the ministerial proposition. Such, at least, was not the law of Parliament, nor of common sense ; and, although, if it had come from any other quarter, he would have treated it with what it better deserved than an answer, yet, as being given with the weight due to the learned lord's professional station, it could not be overlooked ; and he would take the liberty of adding, that, if he was surprised at such an observation from a professional person, he was doubly surprised at its coming from one in the situation of the learned lord, whose sole seat in that House was from a place of the sort now to be disfranchised, and moreover was suspected to be more than fictitious.\*

The most remarkable feature in the speech of the learned lord, continued Mr. Croker, was the

---

\* The circumstances to which Mr. Croker here alluded were these. Shortly after Mr. Jeffery had been appointed Lord Advocate, and before a seat in parliament had been obtained for him, a vacancy occurred in the representation of the Perth district of Scotch boroughs, in consequence of the decision of an election committee in December. The Lord Advocate immediately became a candidate. The district contained five boroughs, of which Dundee was one. Of the other four, the Lord Advocate and his opponent had each secured two. If Dundee was entitled to vote, it was in the interest of the former ; if it was not, the remaining four were equally divided, and the casting vote belonged to Forfar, which was in the interest of his antagonist. But Dundee had been disfranchised not long before by a judgment of the Court of Session ; and the committee had ruled in December that it had no right to vote. There was no legal magis-

tracy in existence to elect a commissioner ; there were no persons entitled to choose a new magistracy. The Lord Advocate's party, however, prevailed on the old magistracy of Dundee to meet and elect a commissioner, as if no judgment annulling their very existence as magistrates had been pronounced. The commissioner appeared and voted at the election ; and, the returning officer, under the election statutes, holding himself not entitled to look at any thing but the commission, the Lord Advocate obtained the return. He was petitioned against. A few days after the discussion recorded in the text, the committee to whom the petition was referred, at once unseated him, and earl Fitzwilliam then brought him in for the borough of Malton, where sir James Scarlett had just vacated his seat in consequence of finding himself unable to support the reform bill.

---

tracy in existence to elect a commissioner ; there were no persons entitled to choose a new magistracy. The Lord Advocate's party, however, prevailed on the old magistracy of Dundee to meet and elect a commissioner, as if no judgment annulling their very existence as magistrates had been pronounced. The commissioner appeared and voted at the election ; and, the returning officer, under the election statutes, holding himself not entitled to look at any thing but the commission, the Lord Advocate obtained the return. He was petitioned against. A few days after the discussion recorded in the text, the committee to whom the petition was referred, at once unseated him, and earl Fitzwilliam then brought him in for the borough of Malton, where sir James Scarlett had just vacated his seat in consequence of finding himself unable to support the reform bill.



were required to decide? He had told the House in plain terms, that they must concede what was proposed, because they were compelled by necessity, and, for his proof, he had referred to the petitions on the table, which, according to him, did not come from the dangerous classes—oh, no!—those were not the men who petitioned for Reform—but from the more favoured, peaceable, and moderate orders of society, whom this bill was to call into life and activity. Now, he had read two or three hundred of these petitions, and he defied the members opposite, who wielded these petitions as arms against the enemies of the bill, to produce any one from which it appeared that the people would be satisfied with the measure now proposed. Of the many hundreds that he had read, there were only two or three which did not demand infinitely more than the bill conceded. These two or three were, indeed, distinguished by a happy generality, that left them to expect any thing or nothing. He would select one, because it was well and moderately worded, and afforded the best specimen of the sort of demands made by the people. It was the petition from Merthyr Tydvil. That town was a large manufacturing place, with a numerous and intelligent population. The petition asked for four things. The first was the right—the just right (as they termed it) of having all placemen dismissed from the House of Commons. The second was for the right of annual, or, at most, triennial parliaments. The third was the only point which the measure of the noble lord met, and that was, the right of having all the large towns and populous districts represented in the House of Commons, and

that those places which came within the class of close and decayed boroughs, containing few inhabitants, should be disfranchised. The fourth claimed the right of every man to vote at elections, who was called on in any way to contribute either to national or local taxation, directly or indirectly. “These are,” said the petitioners, “the principal rights which we at present demand.” All the other petitions, or, at least, the majority of them, used the same language. When it was answered to the hon. member for Preston, who objected to the limitation of 10*l.* a-year as a qualification for a voter, that some line must be drawn, he thought that a rational reply. That line, however, must be arbitrary—it must be subject to the discretion of those who drew it, and for that reason he knew not a better than that drawn by the petitioners, for there was some foundation for that in the ancient constitution of the country, and it did not seem to be drawn arbitrarily and without reference to principle. Their principle was, that every man who was called on to contribute to the exigencies of the State, should have a right to vote. He said, therefore, that the measure, so far from satisfying the petitioners, would but increase the alarm and disappointment of the people.

Such was the character of the demands made by the petitioners, and it was not useless to remark how the crop of petitions, always referred to with so much triumph, had been called into existence, the more especially when the House was told that there was nothing new, or temporary, or artificial in the excitement which had been stirred up. The very history of this petitioning proved the con-



trary, and shewed that the outcry, of which ministers now took advantage, had been called forth by themselves, aided by the infection of foreign example, that they might take advantage of it. In 1821, there were nineteen petitions for reform; in 1822, there were twelve; in 1823, there were twenty nine; in 1824, there were none; in 1825, none; in 1826, none; in 1827, none; in 1828, none; in 1829, still none; in the Session of 1830, there were fourteen, and then came the dissolution of parliament. The noble lord and the several gentlemen who were with him then went down to the general election, under circumstances which gave them no reason whatever to expect or hope that they should be in their present situation; they accordingly looked about for a political lever to move the then existing government, and on the hustings, from bow-windows, and from their different abodes in all parts of the country, they addressed the people on the subject. The people answered the appeal of the noble lord, and 650 petitions were the result. What could prove more clearly the action of extraneous and factitious influence in calling forth this expression of political sentiment?

After arguing on the practical advantages of that variety in the existing representation which it was proposed to replace by one uniform standard, and answering the objections urged against the complexity of the present system, which he described as being like the complexity of the universe, "complex only in appearance, but within all order, working out the most beautiful and magnificent results,"—Mr. Croker went into a more particular examination of the manner in which it was now in-

tended to distribute the franchise. It appeared, he stated, from the returns laid before the House, that there were, in all, 378,000 houses in England and Wales, and that, if they were divided into sixteen classes, the three lowest of these classes would contain 250,000. Thus it clearly appeared, that according to the new system property would not be fairly represented. It had been stated, that, in framing the new plan, it was necessary to draw a line somewhere. Let the House then mark the effects of the line which had been drawn. The noble lord drew his first line, without even attempting to assign any reason for it, except the *sic volo, sic jubeo*, and disfranchised all boroughs whose population was under two thousand. He then drew his second line in like manner, without assigning any reason; and giving a single member to the boroughs with a population, between the 2,000 and the 4,000, he generously bestowed two members on those whose population exceeded the 4,000. The third line was drawn at 10,000, and the fourth at 20,000. Then to all places having 10,000 inhabitants was given only one member, as to places between 2,000 and 4,000, and to places whose population was 20,000 was given only the same number of members which was retained for such boroughs as Knaresborough and Tavistock. Now, he could not conceive how ministers, according to their own arithmetical principles—and here they gave the House no other—could account for giving a representative to a borough whose population was under 4,000, when, in the creation of electoral rights, they went upon the principle that one member was enough for a population of 10,000. He



did not mean to impute any improper motives, but certainly the line drawn was in some respects extraordinary, and for certain interests singularly felicitous. Here was the whig borough of Malton in Yorkshire, and the House would be amused to see how very nicely, in regard to it, the line had been drawn. The inhabitants of Malton in 1821, were precisely 4,005, and the line enabled it to retain its two members;—and thus, while the rest of the country was disfranchised, while the counties (except a few of the manufacturing counties in the north) were curtailed of their fair proportions, and amputated of their limbs, the fortunate borough of Malton escaped unscathed—so near was the line, and yet so conveniently distant. But there was more than this. In the north riding of Yorkshire were Malton, Richmond, and Thirsk, making up amongst them a population of 10,084 inhabitants; in the west riding were Halifax, Huddersfield, and Wakefield, making up amongst them a population more than three times as large, viz. 36,000; yet the former were to have four representatives, and the latter only three. He would tell the noble mover, that he would be compelled to explain this fact to the country; the country must know, whence came this strange departure from his own principles. Take another example. Calne, Tavistock, Bedford, and Knaresborough, all of them whig boroughs, made up amongst them an aggregate population of 19,400:—yet they were to return no fewer than eight members; while Halifax, Huddersfield, and Wakefield, with nearly double the population, were to return only three! Blackburne, which had five times the

population of Tavistock, was to have only one representative, while the latter had two; and Bolton, with a population of 22,000, was to have only one while Bedford was to have two; and Brighton, with 30,000 inhabitants was to have only one, and be no better off than if its population had been only 2,000. He would only add that the result was, that there was a vast majority of representatives in favour of a set of towns whose aggregate population was 20,000, over a body of seventeen great towns whose aggregate population amounted to 170,000. Nothing so monstrous as this plan had ever been heard of; and were he ever so favourable to the general principle of reform, he should feel it his duty to resist so blind and unjust a disproportion. But he had in vain waited to hear some intelligible statement of practical evils to justify even that general principle. He had been told, indeed, that the times demanded it—that the deluge of public opinion was rising, and that all who expected safety must fly to this frail and slippery raft. He would answer,

“Trust not that fatal and perfidious bark,  
Built in th’ eclipse, and rigged with curses dark”—

“Remain where you are, and wait till the threatening waters subside. What you hear is not only a fictitious, but a factitious clamour. Be patient, and the people will recover, becoming sensible of the value of what they would lose, and the uselessness of what they would gain.”

Mr. J. T. Hope said, that as yet he had been able to detect only one argument used to shew the House that this reform was necessary, and



that argument was, that the voice of the people required a reform, and therefore reform must be granted. This was but feeble reasoning. If it proved any thing, it proved too much. It proved that the House of Commons was no longer a deliberative assembly, but was on all occasions, and under all circumstances, to give way to the demands of the people. Cambyzes once demanded a change utterly subversive of the fixed character of the laws of the Medes and Persians, and his council were at a loss how to conduct themselves. They, however, discovered a law by which it was provided that the king could do no wrong, and, acting upon that, they made the change required. So now, with respect to reform, no argument was urged in its favour, but that the sovereign people required it, and they required it because they required it; and he supposed the ministers had, like Cambyzes's council, discovered a law which said that the people could do no wrong. He would admit that out of doors a feeling in favour of reform did exist; he would even go farther, and allow that it was strongly pressed upon that House, and allow that, too, without designating the expression of it as clamorous, or by any of those harsh terms which had been so freely used against the people when they implored that house not to pass the Catholic relief bill. But he denied that the expression of the public feeling in favour of reform went at all to the extent represented; and also that it was of that durable character which some hon. members contended it was. Two classes were said to demand reform. One, the radicals, who looked only to plunder and anarchy, and they had

been given up; the other consisting of intelligent respectable persons of the middle classes. Did the middle classes call for a theoretical reform because it would be beneficial merely as such? Assuredly not. For every petition from those classes praying for reform prayed also for a reduction of taxation and for retrenchment; and it must be evident to every one who paid the slightest attention to those petitions that reform was regarded merely as the means of obtaining the end desired, which was a relief from present burthens. Nor did this conduct astonish him. There were unquestionably many taxes which pressed heavily on the middle classes—as the assessed taxes and the malt tax; and when the public mind was inflamed by exaggerated statements—when it had been said by hon. members now on the other side of the House, but who had changed places since they made such statements, that the public money had been squandered—and when false lists of salaries and emoluments had been published—it was not at all extraordinary that, in a moment of discontent and dissatisfaction, the people should call for reform as a remedy for all their supposed grievances. The case had materially changed since the hon. gentlemen opposite came into power. They had examined into the expenditure, and they had found that they could not make any reductions. And that being the case, they were bound not only to tell the people that fact, as he confessed they had done, but also to state how a reform of that House would enable them to meet the desires of the country with respect to retrenchment and a reduction of taxation. Would a reform in that House amend the condition of Ireland? Ireland was



hardly touched by the projected measure. Would a reform in that House better the condition of the labouring agriculturist? It would take some old privileges away, but it would not confer a single new one. But what were the circumstances which would enable the government to make the reductions required? Why, a material reduction of the national debt, and the breaking up of our colonial empire. These were the sacrifices which would enable the administration to effect a reduction in taxation commensurate with the notions and desires, which, however unconsciously and unintentionally, had been raised in the public mind; and what portion of the middle classes of the community would consent to such an abandonment of justice, of power, and dignity? Then what answer was to be given to the middling classes? Let those in power give utterance to the truth. Let these things be fairly stated. Let the people be told by the government that a reform in that House would not enable them to reduce the taxation to any serious amount, and it would speedily be apparent that reform was not asked as a theoretical measure, and the cry for it would die away.

Mr. Tennyson, member for Bletchingley; lord Dudley Stuart, for Arundel; Mr. Long Wellesley, for St. Ives; lord Howick for Higham Ferrers, although these boroughs were all to be totally or partially disfranchised, supported the bill, on the ground which had been previously stated by other speakers—that a more extensive share in the representation was the right of the people who demanded it, and would restore peace and strength to the country. Lord Howick, the son of the prime

minister, said that the proposal before the House had, in his opinion, been wise and patriotically made. At all events, it would not be prudent to disappoint the excited hopes of the people. Whether it was proper to have excited these hopes so far, he would not stay to inquire. He begged the House to remember that the thing was done. The proposal had been made, and it was now too late to recall it. It was impossible to suppose that the reformers would be satisfied with any thing short of what was now intended. More they might have, but less they would never accept.

Mr. Russell, a member for the county of Durham; sir J. Johnston, a representative of the county of York; Mr. Wood, the colleague of Mr. Hunt in representing the universal suffrage of Preston, took the same side. On the other hand colonel Sibthorp, who sat for Lincoln; colonel Tyrrel, for the county of Essex; sir George Clerk, for the county of Edinburgh; sir George Warrender, one of the members for Honiton; and Mr. William Peel, one of those for Yarmouth, repeated the arguments which had already been put forward against either the necessity or the expediency of the measure.

Mr. North said, if there was any man who had believed that the spirit of moderation actuated his majesty's government, the speech of lord John Russell must have undeceived him. He knew there were many reformers, all differing in opinion; but he had not thought there was any gentlemen who could destroy the British constitution even in the hope of producing something better, without feeling deep regret for our ancient institutions. But the noble



lord had insulted the victim which he was about to sacrifice ; he had admitted that that assembly was the noblest in the world, and yet had found it necessary to maintain, that there was nothing disgraceful and injurious with which it might not be charged. He wished they had learned what was the foundation for this tremendous charge against parliament. What had it done, to make them all at once discover in 1831, that they were convicted in the face of the country, and unfit to legislate? What was this new corruption—this malignant disease which had seized on the constitution? The only answer uniformly vouchsafed was, there is a clamour for reform out of doors: if it is not yielded to, there will be violence—a convulsion. He could never believe that that House ought to yield to such intimidation. No man would be more ready than himself to support the deliberate voice of the people of England, but he did not hold that every feverish symptom, every hobby of the people, was to be considered the real current of popular opinion. They had a free press, and every system was brought forward with great ability and facility. It was the duty of parliament to look calmly on the effervescence of public opinion, and expect those transitory gusts of popular feeling; above all, they should beware of mistaking them for the real manifestation of popular opinion. If ever there was a time when public men deserved the gratitude of their fellow subjects, it was in Ireland in 1782. Mr. Grattan and Mr. Flood had then contended for a free constitution. They justly obtained popularity, and had done nothing to forfeit it in 1783, when the parliament was

VOL. LXXIII.

dissolved. After the dissolution of parliament, the counties, cities, and towns did not prove their gratitude. The men who had so gloriously led them to independence became unpopular. Mr. Flood and his illustrious colleague were rejected. At that time they had demagogues clamorous for parliamentary reform, yet the people, whom they supported, were found rejecting those illustrious patriots, and they made their way again into parliament through the boroughs of a liberal gentleman.

Mr. North called the attention of the House particularly to one effect, which would be produced in Ireland by the bill. Its framers had evidently forgotten the great change produced there by the emancipation act. When they admitted the Roman Catholics to the privileges of the constitution, it was necessary to guard against their interest becoming too powerful, and in that view the House had disfranchised the 40s. freeholders. But if the new plan came into a law, the whole of that arrangement would be upset, and the Protestants of Ireland would be bound hand and foot, and thrown out of their elective rights.

Mr. Robert Grant, who, like lord Palmerston, had been the disciple of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson, and was now joined to a ministry resolved to carry measures to which these distinguished men had declared, at every period of their public lives, irreconcilable enmity, as a marked and leading part of their political creed, was compelled to admit, that he had been hostile to reform; but recent events, he said, both in this country and in others, had induced him to change his opinion. Much excitement on this question

[F]



there certainly was, and it was the misgovernment of the late ministry alone which had produced it. He then proceeded to justify the different parts of the scheme, and particularly, the total or partial disfranchisement of the smaller boroughs, upon grounds which might be right or wrong, in point of argument, but certainly were not to be ranked among recent events. The House of Commons, he said, ought to be the House of the whole Commons, and nothing but the House of Commons. This was not such a House, although it was said that the close boroughs constituted a beauty in our system. If any other influence than that of the people was exercised in that House, it could not be said, constitutionally speaking, that the members of parliament were the fair and legitimate representatives of the people. What was the theory of our constitution? What its practice? Decidedly different, and he regretted it; but the House might rest assured that the time had now gone by, when the people of England were unacquainted with the nature and value of their rights and interests. Where could any authority be found for the *dictum* that other influences than those of the people should be admitted into the House? Neither in Blackstone, nor De Lolme. On the contrary, they both contended, in the beautiful theory of our constitution, that the House of Commons was to be nothing else than the direct representatives of the people. By the express terms of our constitution, by the regulations and orders of this House, peers were not allowed to interfere in the election of members of parliament. The people out of doors knew this, as well as the members

of the House; and in the present state of knowledge it would be a ridiculous attempt to blind them by new theories or fanciful speculations, however ingenious they might be. Delusion had long been tried and had failed; the power of knowledge was every day making itself known, and it would be worse than futile upon the part of any government to resist it. Such times had existed, and had passed away, and it would be wild in the extreme to talk of their return. The general diffusion of knowledge enabled the people to know their rights, and they were now in a condition to assert them.

Mr. O'Connell, the most selfish and mischievous of all demagogues, commenced a long speech by assuring ministers that they would have in support of their plan, not only his vote, but whatever influence he might possess elsewhere, and that, too, although he had many objections to the bill. He was an advocate for universal suffrage, for shortening the duration of parliaments, and for vote by ballot, in all of which points the bill was defective. But still it was a liberal and extensive measure; and by its operation it would either demonstrate that the other measures, to which he was favourable, would be of no farther advantage, or it would furnish the means of obtaining them safely and certainly; as a radical reformer, therefore, he heartily accepted the bill.

The extension of the franchise to copyholders and leaseholders, he highly applauded. Though copy-holders held by copy of court-roll, their property was as valuable and as saleable as if it were freehold. By introducing leaseholders, too, they avoided this



absurdity, that hitherto a man might have a lease of 1,000 acres for 1,000 years, but could not vote, although his next neighbour, who owned, perhaps, a single acre upon an old life, enjoyed the franchise. He was delighted, too, at the unsparingness with which the pruning knife had been applied to the boroughs, and he directed against them the usual arguments. Was it not the first order of the House, even before the king's speech was delivered, that it was a breach of privilege for any peer or prelate to interfere with the freedom of election? and could they be told, in the face of this, that the duke of Newcastle had the right of appointing a member of the Commons' House of Parliament? Would gentlemen tell him, in the teeth of that House, that the giving that power to a lord was "the old constitution?" Yet these were the gentlemen who denied hypocrisy. The hypocrisy of that resolution was theirs, or they were parties to it. If any gentleman attempted to violate that resolution clandestinely, it was the duty of the Speaker to defeat the attempt. But if the violation of it was, as gentlemen insisted, the "old constitution," let the question be regularly brought before the House, and let the resolution be rescinded. But let them not be told that a bill to enforce its observance, whilst it stood upon their books, was a revolution.

The learned member, having insisted at great length on the open corruption practised in the smaller, half-closed boroughs, and the practice of beating up for a third man, to compel the two candidates to be liberal, asked, if there was any conscientious man, who

would give his voice for the preservation of a system which opened such a field for profligacy, corruption, and the violation of the privileges of that House—every six years, almost every year? Would any one—at least, would any one out of that House—deny that such was the case in all the half-open boroughs? Nobody. Would any one in that House deny it? Certainly, no one; except those who in sophistical speeches, which said nothing distinctly, and deceived the speakers themselves, insinuated what they dared not assert. Who would deny that the votes of those burgesses were sold as oxen were sold in Smithfield, and that the seats which represent them were sold and let as the stalls in Leadenhall-market? Did any man suppose that the people of England would not resist and destroy that system of corruption? He did not mean by any sudden violence, but by the force of opinion rising gradually, calmly, and irresistibly, as a giant rising from his sleep. Was it fit, then, that gentlemen with the full knowledge that corruption is so common in those boroughs, and tolerating that corruption themselves, should come into that House and gravely vote a resolution, that any person obtaining a seat there by bribery is guilty of a gross violation of the rights of the Commons of England? An outcry had been raised against corporation robbery. Now he had looked into thirty-six of these cases, and of these only sixteen were corporations; the other twenty had never been corporations at all. "I farther insist, said Mr. O'Connell, that all those members, who denounce this corporation robbery, shall join with me in procuring the repeal of the union be-



tween Britain and Ireland; for, if the proposed bill contained such a seizure of the franchise as parliament had no right to make, what would they say to the seizure of the franchises of 100 corporations by the act of union. Parliament, too, had not done this, because the boroughs were corrupt; it admitted that they were innocent, for it voted 13,000 guineas a-piece to the proprietors of forty of them. He was entitled therefore to demand the assistance of his present antagonists, either in carrying through this bill, or in carrying through a repeal of the union.

Mr. O'Connell, however, was not equally satisfied with the intentions of the framers of the new scheme in so far as regarded Ireland. In the propositions regarding that kingdom he saw the malign influence prevailing which seemed to control every thing that related to Ireland. The capital of England was to double the number of its representatives, having sixteen instead of eight; the capital of Scotland was to be proportionally benefitted; but no such boon was intended for the capital of Ireland. Of those English counties to which an additional number of representatives was given, there were fifteen inferior in population to the county of Antrim; nineteen inferior to the county of Down; twenty-two inferior to Tipperary; and there was not one, with the exception of Lancashire and Yorkshire, but was inferior to the county of Cork. It might be said, indeed, that Cork contained a considerable number of boroughs; but, even excluding them, its population was greater by 100,000 than any of the favoured English counties, with the

exceptions he had mentioned. He demanded, therefore, an additional member for each of the counties of Antrim, Cork, Down, Galway, Kerry, Mayo, and Tyrone, for he could shew that every one of them was above the line of 200,000. He demanded another for the town of Galway, and another for Kilkenny and its vicinage, which, before the union, had sent four representatives to parliament:—and he was the better entitled to make these demands, as there confessedly were sixty-two members in the bank.

There was another provision of the bill, of which, on behalf of Ireland, he thought he had a right to complain. It was that by which borough freeholders were deprived of votes in the county. That was taking the privilege from a very respectable and excellent class of electors—men who had the independence and intelligence to think for themselves, and the sturdiness to act upon the suggestions of their own consciences. A large class of the respectable inhabitants of Belfast were thus excluded from any share in voting for the representation of Antrim; and the inhabitants of Tralee, in a similar way, from their proper share in the representation of Kerry. Then copyholders were enfranchised, or to be enfranchised, by the present bill, and so were leaseholders for years in England. Why were persons of a similar description in Ireland not to be enfranchised also? A very large proportion of the property of Ireland was of necessity let upon leases for years; and surely, if the principle were good in England, there was nothing in Ireland which went to vitiate it. A very large proportion of the church lands in Ireland were let upon leases for years, and he might be



asked, with what consistency did he demand the enfranchisement of bishops' tenants? Did not that go directly to increase the influence of the church? Gentlemen, he trusted, would remember that the reverend and right reverend persons to whom those lands belonged took especial care to have the leases renewed as often as they possibly could, and to procure the highest prices that the tenants could be induced to pay; for this reason the tenants were independent of their landlords; and therefore to give them the franchise was to bestow it upon a large body of intelligent and independent men. Ireland, too, he thought had a right to complain, that the 50*l.* and 20*l.* freeholders, being non-resident, were to be deprived of their votes. He would select Dungarvon, merely as an instance; there, the 5*l.* house-renters were to be disfranchised as well as the 50*l.* and 20*l.* freeholders. Those instances, he conceived, ought to be enough to satisfy the House that the present bill had been prepared without sufficient knowledge of the state of representation in the different counties and boroughs in Ireland. Was the House prepared to get rid of the old established system of the 5*l.* house-renters in the Irish boroughs. Then, why was there not disfranchisement in Ireland, as well as in England? In Ireland, they had seventeen, if not nineteen, nomination boroughs. The borough of Portarlington, for example, was brought openly into the market, and it was announced that any gentleman might be returned for it who would lend lord Portarlington 40,000*l.*, or 50,000*l.*, at legal interest, upon good security; the person who lent the money became the hon. member for Portarlington.

It had been argued by Mr. North, that, in Ireland, the effect of the bill would be, to increase the power of the Catholics at the expense of the Protestants. Was there never, then, to be an end of religious feuds and animosities? Was every improvement to be met by the same old cry of Catholic and Protestant—the one set against the other? And was it not enough to have kept the Catholics for centuries from religious freedom, but now to make them pay for the toleration they enjoyed, by a forfeiture of their civil rights? It was time, at length, to break down the long-continued monopoly which had originated with Cromwell and his party, a power which had been cemented by the blood of the followers of Charles I., men who afterwards were betrayed by his son Charles II. There was no one who had the slightest acquaintance with those subjects, who did not perfectly well know that every borough in Ireland was one of the closest and most compact monopolies that could be imagined. Forty boroughs were created by James I. in one day, for the purpose of furthering his designs upon the property of two entire provinces—those boroughs consisted each of only twelve burgesses, and some of them were so poor and so deficient of inhabitants, that they found difficulty in procuring even that number.

Mr. O'Connell, adverting to the argument in favour of the close boroughs, derived from the fact of their having sent into the House of Commons so much talent, which would not otherwise have found an entrance, maintained, that the argument was supported by simply shewing up the stars, and concealing all that was mean and obscure—thereby shewing,



that he did not understand the way in which the argument, whatever might be its intrinsic worth, was put: viz., "Has any equal number of boroughs, enjoying a popular franchise, and a numerous constituency, introduced into parliament an equal number of distinguished men?" Then he abused Mr. Canning and Burke, two of the names in that heart-stirring list, saying of the latter, in the face of the House of Commons, "Burke was a man who thought the people ought to be contented, if the rich and great were well and comfortably provided for. Burke got a pension, paid, he believed, till the present hour; and the people, if they could get rid of the pension, would give a receipt in full for any eulogium pronounced upon his name."

Mr. Attwood thought the House would agree with him, that, before consenting to destroy the present system, they ought to ascertain distinctly what that was which they were called on to cure, and what means they possessed of guarding against the consequences of concession. It was said, that the existing system of representation did not conform itself to the existing state of society, that new towns had sprung up into wealth, which were excluded from parliament, and thus the trading and commercial interests of the country did not enjoy their due share in the representation. Now it did not appear to him, in point of fact, nor had it yet been shewn, that the commercial and trading interests were not duly represented, and he requested that members would not take that for granted, without examining the question. Whence had the real representation of the commerce of the coun-

try originated? Liverpool sent two members, but many of her merchants, who had sat in that House, had sat for boroughs. Manchester, under this change, was to have two representatives; but at what time hitherto had not that place had at least three times two members, who protected its interests and spoke its demands? Eight members were to be added to the metropolis. But would they be merchants? What merchants had Westminster or Southwark ever returned? And, with respect to the city of London itself, though he had every respect for the members who sat for it, yet it could not be denied that they were not really the men that represented its commerce. Who were these men? The two hon. members for Callington—the member for Bramber—the member for Midhurst—the member for Wendover—and the members for Old Sarum—those were the men in that House who represented the commercial interests of the metropolis. What they were about to do was, to give up a practical representation, and introduce on the contrary a nominal one—the very thing the ministry pretended that they were trying to avoid. The reason why men wished to sit in that House was, for the sake of distinction; and did any one suppose that the wealthy merchants of Manchester would be content with the two members whom that place was to have? No such thing; they had always sat in the House to a much greater extent, and this bill would be the means of preventing that in future. They were to be shut out by the very door that it was pretended would open the way to them.

The case against the boroughs had always been put thus. Is it



not monstrous that the miserable occupiers of a few miserable houses should send two members to parliament? But that was not a correct statement of the case: it was the owners, and not the occupiers of those houses, that returned the members, and that right had descended to them with their property, as a means of protecting that property itself. He would say that their boroughs were as inviolable as their land; but it was a fair question, whether, as their property ran so great a risk, such a representation was not required to secure it against that risk. He thought the noble lord, in the history of his own family and ancestors, might have learned that property was exposed to all sorts of risks, and that cupidity and profligacy were ever ready to make a snatch at it. That noble lord had admitted, indeed, that the boroughs were vested rights—that, however, they were merely trusts—and, because they were trusts, and not property, he would destroy them. “I do not know,” said Mr. Attwood, “whence that noble lord drew his wisdom, when he spoke of sacrificing any kind of trust. What, I wish to ask, is property of any kind but a trust? All property is of the nature of a trust, and, for that reason, I will not sacrifice Old Sarum—on that ground I will protect all property, and, on that ground, the noble lord, in sacrificing the rotten boroughs, may find that he is not giving security to Woburn. The only ground why property should be protected is, that it is for the good of the community, and, on the same ground, I am prepared to defend all the trusts it is proposed to destroy.” He regretted much, that ministers

should have brought forward a measure of such a nature in these times of agitation, when there was a sort of national convention sitting throughout the land; when the whole country was agitated; and when it was not improbable that by setting the example of confiscating trusts, they might lead to a confiscation of property.

When the proposers of this measure represented it as a renovation of the constitution, they were imposing on themselves, and attempting to impose upon others by words; for the constitution, which they meant to restore, must be one which had never existed, either in this or in any other country. He knew well that, in the minds of the reformers, the constitution was supposed to consist of three co-equal and co-extensive powers, each of them disconnected from, and independent of, the others, which it was to check and control. This was their theory; but it was utterly impracticable to any other purpose than producing a democracy. Into what measure, on this theory, could not the two Houses of Parliament drive the Crown? into what measure could not the Commons, on this theory, drive the Crown and the peers, by refusing the supplies, leaving, if the former resisted the democratic part of the constitution, no alternative save a dissolution of all government? He defied any man to invent a constitution less capable of being carried into execution, and, if it was carried into execution, less capable of promoting the general welfare. Accordingly, it never had been attempted to be so carried into execution, except by some men bigotted to a theory. The men who had actually carried



our constitution into effect, were not of that class. They were not men disposed to sacrifice to a theory the public happiness, and also the interests of the people. They were men who were convinced that the people were not made for a theory of government, but that government was made for the people; and, according as their interests demanded it, and according to circumstances, these statesmen made one part of the constitution yield to another; one part supply the deficiencies of another; one part do that which was necessary to the happiness of the others, and so kept them all moving together in harmony, giving the people protection for their liberty, and, for their property, the security of fixed and stable laws. But, under this novel and impracticable theory, the House of Commons was to be made something which it never had been. The secretary for Ireland had said that the new constitution would be only a new constitution of the House of Commons, not of the whole frame of government. Be it so; yet this new constitution of the House of Commons was to create, under that name, a power with which neither the spirit nor the practice of the constitution had ever before brought the other two estates into connection, and was thus to alter radically and essentially the relation in which the three estates had hitherto stood to each other, and in which alone the only practical balance of a mixed constitution was to be found. The House of Commons was to be freed from every trace of any thing other than democratic creation; it was to consist of an elected body, always changing—having no attachment to stability—composed,

of necessity, of men the most ambitious and most enterprising—of men of the greatest talents and intelligence to be found in the age and in the country; and that was, in theory, to be the result of the new elections, and this was to be a pure House of Commons. He should be glad to learn from the noble lord who had introduced the bill, where he could find a single example in history, having the guarantee of experience, of any body, purely democratic, elected by the great body of the people, and deriving its existence from the popular voice, existing in conjunction with hereditary monarchy and the peerage? There were no such examples, except such as taught them a serious lesson. Let them direct their eyes to the new constitutions formed in neighbouring kingdoms—let them look to the Chamber of Deputies in France, and they would find that the Chamber of Peers never rejected a measure which had been agreed to by the Chamber of Deputies, when the latter body did not immediately question the utility of the other Chamber. Did the House of Commons and the House of Lords differ, the dispute went off quietly; but it was not so in France. In France, the result of the Chamber of Peers rejecting a measure was, that the other Chamber immediately inquired if the Chamber of Peers ought to exist. These appeared to him, at least, the kind of dangers which we might expect from this untried bill, which had no experience to sanction it, but which we were warned against by the dangers of another country. It was not a measure of restoration; for what it was about to create never existed: it was not a measure of



conservation ; it was not a measure for repairing the structure ; it was a measure tearing up the foundations of the constitution and laying them anew.

Sir James Graham, the first Lord of the Admiralty, again referred to the act disfranchising the 40s. freeholders of Ireland, as a precedent more than justifying every thing which this bill proposed to do in the way of disfranchisement, if a proper case of reasonableness and expediency were made out. On this point, too, the authority of Burke was decisive, who had said, that as charters had originally been granted for specific purposes, Parliament had a clear right to deal with them when they ceased to conduce to these specific purposes. The right being clear, a glance at the actual state of the representation would, he thought, satisfy every reasonable man, that it was such as now required the efficient application of that right. It would be found that twenty-eight boroughs, the electors of which were under 1000, sent above fifty members to parliament. There were ninety-seven boroughs where the electors did not exceed 100, nine where they were under ten, and twenty-seven where the number was between ten and twenty-five, which returned a great proportion of the representatives. Of all the boroughs enjoying the franchise, there were 115, in none of which did the number of electors exceed 200. Although, therefore, all the borough electors were pure and independent electors, the system brought into play a mere miserable fraction of the citizens. But how stood the fact as to their independence ? Out of 221 borough members, more than one half viz. 127

were nominated by 111 peers and commoners ; 143 peers and commoners returned, in one way or other, 193 members ; and it was capable of proof that there were sixteen peers who filled, by their mere nomination, 76 seats in that House. Such was the cause of complaint on the part of the people ; and no man who fairly considered the subject could come to any satisfactory conclusion but this—that it was necessary to make a strenuous effort for the redress of so great a grievance.

Sir James Graham then applied himself to the remarks of Mr. Croker upon the manner in which the line of disfranchisement had been drawn. He admitted that, if ministers, in drawing that line, had been influenced by such feelings as appeared to be insinuated against them, then would they not only be unworthy of the situation in which they were placed, but they would be unfit to associate with any body of private gentlemen. Ministers had acted not from sinister views, but proceeded on the principles of men of honour. He should surprise the House if he read the list of boroughs which must have been interfered with, if ministers had drawn the line so as to affect Knaresborough, Tavistock, and Calne. Ministers had no other document to refer to than the statistical returns of the year 1821. He did not mean to say that it was a perfect document ; he knew that it contained errors ; but there was one advantage connected with it, namely, that its details were evidently favourable to the extension of the franchise. Now, if the line had been drawn with reference to the population of Calne, they would have been obliged to disfranchise eleven other boroughs,



viz. Malton, Newport, Andover, Grantham, Devizes, Hertford, St. Alban's, Dartmouth, Bridgewater, Pomfret, and Chippenham, each of which was smaller than Calne. If they had taken as the line of distinction the population of the borough of Knaresborough, they would have had to disfranchise, wholly or partially, twenty-three other boroughs, including Calne, Tavistock, Rippon, Chichester, Peterborough, Shrewsbury, Tewksbury, and Barnstaple, which were inferior in extent to Knaresborough. Therefore it was, that Calne, Tavistock, and Knaresborough, were not interfered with; since, if ministers had included them in their plan, they must have disfranchised a far greater number of boroughs than they thought it expedient to interfere with. He, however, was quite sure that, let ministers have drawn the line wherever they would, objections of a similar nature would have been advanced by those who were unfriendly to reform. Again, if they looked at the tax returns, they would find that, in the sixty boroughs to be disfranchised, there were only 1471 houses rated at 10*l.*, while in Sheffield there were 1556 houses so rated—that was more than 100 houses above all those in the sixty boroughs. There were forty-seven boroughs which ministers proposed to leave with one member each, in which the number of houses rated at 10*l.* was 6323, while, in the parish of Mary-le-bone, which did not now send members to parliament, there were 10,421 houses rated at and above that sum, being nearly one-third more than was contained in all these boroughs. The house would be able to decide whether ministers had been ac-

tuated by any partial and unfair motives in selecting the boroughs which were to be disfranchised.

Neither was it true that they had been goaded on to the adoption of the plan itself by any extraneous excitement. It was not on account of the great excitement which prevailed, that ministers were anxious to carry this measure, but because they could not overlook considerations of prudence and expediency. He founded himself in supporting this proposition on the principle of justice which was the ground-work of all good policy; and, adhering to that, at the same time that he did not overlook the signs of the times, he was thoroughly disposed to make this large concession. That it was calculated to remove the crown from the brow of the sovereign, and shake the stability of the House of peers, was contrary to reason; for he could not understand how monarchy could be endangered by making it rest on the affections of a loyal people. On the contrary all experience shewed, that the throne of England never ran the risk of invasion, much less of subversion, except when attempts were made forcibly to overbear the just wishes of the people, and to stifle their aspirations after liberty. That this reform would be a cure for all the evils which afflicted the country, he did not believe. But when parliament should be freely chosen by the people, though it might not work for them all the benefits which they expected, yet they would know that all would be done for them that was possible; and they would then be more tranquil, more contented, and more peaceable: the safety of the country would be put on a safer basis, for he knew none so safe as the exten-



sion of the suffrage to the most intelligent and industrious classes of the community.

Various other members addressed the House on both sides of the question; but to give even an abstract of what was farther said, would only be loading our pages with tiresome repetition. For the same reason we pass over the reply of lord John Russell, in which he summed up answers which had already been given to objections which had already been stated. To the charge that ministers had not acted with consistency even on their own principles, in so far as they gave a town of 14,000 or 15,000 inhabitants no more members than a borough of 3,000 or 4,000, his lordship answered, that he had never intended his bill to be a measure of symmetry by which the House was to be reduced to a certain number of members for each county. Such a plan of reform might be better or it might be worse; but it had not been intended to go by it. Westminster, with 180,000 inhabitants, returned no more members than St. Alban's, or Reading, or other places containing not one-tenth of the population. That was an anomaly with which he did not interfere—as he found it, so he left it. The measure of dividing the country into districts, and apportioning to each district a certain number of persons, might be a great and a wise scheme, but it had not been thought so; and if the hon. members opposite thought otherwise, let them bring that measure forward, and show themselves more extensive reformers than the present ministers.

The motion for leave to bring in the bill, as well as those for Scotland and Ireland, was not resisted.

The bill itself, however, was not ready, nor brought in, till the 14th, a delay which gave occasion to some members of the opposition to express their surprise, that a plan, which ministers were stated to have so long carefully pondered and concocted, and which had already been subjected to a longer discussion than any measure had ever received in that House, should be even now in so incomplete a state as to be unfit to be presented to parliament. On the 14th the bill was brought in, and read a first time *pro forma* without opposition. On bringing it in, lord John Russell mentioned that one or two alterations and corrections had been made, one of which was that he had discovered that the borough of Bewdley, which he had placed in schedule B, as a borough to be deprived of one of its two members, did, in truth, send only one member to parliament—a striking proof of the carelessness and haste with which the details had been thrown together. He added, that in some instances, large suburbs would be joined to their neighbouring towns, as, Chatham and Stroud to Rochester, Sculcoates to Hull, and Portsea to Portsmouth. Devonport and Stonehouse were to be conjoined, with the right of electing two members, and Plymouth was to be left as it was.

It was not certainly known why the opponents of the bill allowed so keen and lengthened a contest to terminate without dividing the House. Ministers afterwards admitted that, if a division had taken place, they expected to have been left in a minority. But the opposition did not form a combined body; they had no regular plan of party operations, and were guided by no leader. Several members while



strenuously opposing the bill, had at the same time, expressed their wish that it should be allowed to be brought in, so that a division would not have enabled its opponents to have the advantage of their whole strength. Perhaps too, they

did not wish to have the appearance of acting prematurely or unreasonably ; and therefore reserved themselves for the second reading, that stage at which, according to the forms of the House, the fate of the principle of a bill is decided.



## CHAP. III.

*Effects of the Reform Bill on the Public Mind—Conduct of the Reformers—London Declaration—The Press, and Complaint of Breach of Privilege—Debate on the Motion that the Bill be read a Second Time, and Amendment moved that it be read a Second Time that day six months—Speeches of Sir R. Vyvyan—Mr. Sheil—Mr. C. Grant—The Solicitor General—Sir E. Sugden—Mr. Ward—The Second Reading carried by a Majority of One—Irish Reform Bill brought in and read a First Time—Statements of Ministers regarding the Numbers of the House.*

THE second reading of the reform bill had been fixed for the 21st of March. From the moment that the general outlines of the plan had been discussed in parliament, the public excitement had been daily on the increase. The first effect produced was, that, although in point of fact, it did contain none of those things which the most noisy and violent sections of reformers called for as essential parts of any efficient change, yet these men immediately altered their tone, and professed to receive it with open arms. The secret of their conduct was not difficult to be understood. Though the bill gave less than they wished and demanded, it granted more than they had ever expected. They were told by their leaders, even by their parliamentary leaders, too, that, as ministers were resolved to go no further, the proposed measure would be lost, unless they were manfully supported by all who longed after a change. They were exhorted, therefore, to forget in the meantime, the defects of the plan, to be silent regarding the ballot, universal suffrage, or annual parliaments; and to unite in ac-

clamations for the bill, which, while it would give to the people, by its direct operation, a great accession of political power, would thereby furnish to them the surest means of making their way to other and ulterior objects. The passing of the bill would be the first, and a mighty step, made in their own path, and they ought therefore to present no obstacle to its being taken. To all the lovers of change whose views had never been so extravagant, it was still more welcome, for it held out that bribe which human nature can never resist, a bribe to the vanity and desire of power over large bodies of men. The reformers agreed that the ministerial measure should be their standard: "the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill," became their watch-word, at the sound of which all liberality of sentiment, all liberty of thought, all sobriety of reason, all regard to the peace of the community, and the orderly course of society, were set at defiance. Ministers were invested for a time with more than papal infallibility; it was received as a first truth that no part of their measure could be wrong, or



ought to be questioned. They themselves had not manifested much wisdom in declaring, that no argument would make them recede from one inch of the ground which they had taken, and that by this measure they would stand or fall; for such declarations necessarily implied, that discussion was useless—that they did not submit their propositions to parliament as propositions which the wisdom of parliament might alter, but as already forming a plan framed by the wisdom of the cabinet, and which parliament must receive and sanction such as it was. Whether the line of total disfranchisement should be drawn at 1,500, or 2,000, or 2,500, or 3,000; and that of partial disfranchisement, at a thousand, or five hundred, higher and lower; whether the new franchise should be fixed at 10*l.*, or 20*l.*, or 15*l.*;—these, and many other things seemed to be questions not beyond the reach of argument and reason. But in regard to all of them the Cabinet declared that the measure was already fixed as fate; in none of them would it allow the slightest alteration. “This bill as we have framed it, or no bill at all and civil convulsion,” was the language which the cabinet council of the king addressed to the great council of the nation. By thus binding themselves down to their own first plan in a matter in which dogmatism and obstinacy are any thing but wisdom, though they rendered it impossible for themselves afterwards to recede with safety to their honour or their places, they secured the unflinching support of the reformers, who united all their efforts to force upon parliament the ministerial constitution.

And at no period of our history had the efforts made to carry any

great measure been so far removed from the exercise of sober reason, and the conduct of peaceable citizens. So soon as the proposition was unfolded, the manufacturers of petitions were again set to work, and the same places, which a month before had petitioned for much more, now joined in praying that the bill might pass untouched and unimpaired. Bodies of men who had craved reduction of taxation and retrenchment of expenditure, and had desired a more democratic House of Commons as the only means of securing those good objects, now conjured the House to enact a measure of which its very patrons declared, that it would reduce no tax, and cut off no expense. The number of petitions was large, but their value was immensely over-estimated. Every where a large proportion, if not the majority of names, were those of the lowest classes of society, to whom even ministers declared no power must be granted. The more populous the place from which the petition came, the greater was the impure mixture of universal suffrage. Considering that ministers, whenever hard-pressed, uniformly threw themselves back on the alleged voice of the country, it would not have been an un instructive labour to have ascertained how much of that voice came from persons whose opinions resolved themselves merely into this; this bill is to give us power, or the means of obtaining power, and therefore it is good. Of the better classes, the same individuals multiplied their persons. There would be a petition from a town—a petition from different bodies in that town—a petition from its political union—and all this was, to a great extent, nothing more than the voice of the



same men thrice repeated. Neither the quality nor the quantity of names was ever examined. Lord Brougham, in presenting to the House of Lords a petition from certain inhabitants of Edinburgh, said, that upwards of 30,000 names were attached to it, and the House might therefore take it for granted, that they had here the opinion of every male inhabitant of Edinburgh of lawful age; for by the rules of statistics, the population of that capital would not yield a greater number of such individuals. His lordship did not see, that if it was so, he was laying before the House the opinions of the very off-scourings of the Scotch capital, to say nothing of the voices of the very lowest orders, certainly not those on which he and his colleagues wished to build, nor those which any prudent man would follow in moulding political institutions. Neither did his lordship see that, if his statistics were right, the parchments of his petition must be filled with forgeries; for they contained not the name of a single respectable individual, who could not have reckoned scores of his own acquaintances who disapproved of the bill, and hundreds who would neither utter a word, nor give a signature in its favour.

Petitioning, however, was regular, and constitutional; but, subject to all its drawbacks, it did not promise to be effectual. Ministers had threatened convulsions as the consequence of refusing their bill, and the reformers resolved to support them by opinions which indicated its approach, and exhibitions of mere physical mob force which might be used as its means. At their assemblies for petitioning, at the meetings of their political unions, the language of undisguised

menace was used against all who should oppose the bill. The opponents of the measure were not treated as men entitled to entertain their own opinions, and differing on a question, with which, by possibility, reason might have something to do. They were all dealt with as being profligate oppressors who wished to trample on and plunder the people; creatures, therefore, to be hunted down as beasts of prey, if they did not voluntarily fly from before the face of their pursuers. Was there a man who was distinguished for nothing but having discharged all his duties in the world; who had borrowed nothing from aristocratical patronage, and was innocent of the receipt of one farthing of the public money; who, standing on no other foundation than that of his own honest industry and honourable aspirations, had gained for himself a decent reputation in his profession, or a decent competency of fortune in the unpolluted exercise of his calling; and did he, the most estimable of all citizens, doubt, as hundreds of thousands of such citizens did doubt, whether the ends of good government would be served by increasing, as ministers wished to increase, the efficiency of a pure democracy in the constitution; such a man was placed beyond the pale of citizenship. He was a betrayer of the rights of the people; he was a corrupt plunderer of the humble and the poor—he was the mean and crawling slave of the wealthy few—he was entitled to no opinion, or his opinion was of no use except to degrade his character; for it was different from the opinion of those who thought otherwise, and who had determined, in accordance with the



ministry, that to doubt the unmixed wisdom of "the bill," was to manifest a corruption of heart, and an incapacity of understanding, which unfitted the men whom they disgraced for any exercise of judgment on political institutions, and which invited and justified the reformers to impose upon them by force the changes to which they could not be seduced by vanity, self-interest, and love of power.

Such were the menaces of the reformers—and the means of executing them were paraded with still more ostentation. Everywhere, the political unions boasted of the numbers whom they could bring into the field. The chairman of that of Birmingham openly declared, that they could supply two armies, each of them as numerous and brave as that which had conquered at Waterloo, if the king and his ministers should require them in the contest with the boroughmongers—under which appellation were comprehended all who differed from them in opinion. At a reform meeting held in London, while the debate was going on, a colonel Evans announced that he had just arrived from the coast of Sussex where two reform meetings had taken place, and he knew that ten thousand men were ready to march up from Ryegate to London to the support of his majesty's ministers, if they should be defeated in the measure now before the House. In what way were the armies to support ministers against an anticipated vote of the House of Commons? The proceedings of Cromwell and his army were the only thing that rendered such language intelligible. In most of the great towns, large bodies of men actually assembled. The mass was composed of the

lowest classes of the community. In regular array, attended with banners and music, they marched in procession through their towns, which, for the moment, were entirely at their mercy. They did this to manifest their attachment to the bill; it was a new mode of petitioning; but the true object was, to exhibit the physical force which would be employed to seize political power by violence, if it was not conceded by act of parliament. They were guilty of no actual outrage, for the question was yet pending. It was a review of the force to be brought into action, if the negotiations should fail.

The alarm and intimidation, which were thus excited, served the purposes of the reformers in two ways. On the one hand, many persons, who loved not the violent changes which were proposed, were driven into acquiescence, from the apprehension that resistance would produce only confusion. Merchants of London put their names to petitions in favour of the bill, allowing that they thought it bad, but saying they were afraid that its rejection would terminate in something worse. On the other hand, the citizens, who would actively have resisted the change, were overawed from any public expression of their sentiments. They belonged to classes always less noisy and violent, though not less valuable, than the crowds which assembled at the command of demagogues: they would have been blamed for adding to the excitement by imprudent opposition; they would have been held out to the fury of the mob as objects of hatred and abhorrence. Nevertheless many petitions were presented against the bill; and a de-



claration was put forth, signed by several hundreds of merchants, bankers, and influential citizens of London, in which they expressed themselves thus:—"While we should have been far from opposing ourselves to the adoption of any proposition so recommended, of a temperate character, gradual in its operation, consistent with justice and the ancient usages of this realm, and having for its object the correction of acknowledged abuses, or any amelioration in the administration of public affairs which might seem to be called for by the changes or necessities of the times, we feel it impossible to regard in that light a measure which, by its unprecedented and unnecessary infringement on the rights and privileges of large and wealthy bodies of people, would go far to shake the foundations of that constitution under which our sovereign holds his title to his throne, his nobles to their estates, and ourselves and the rest of our fellow-subjects to the various possessions and immunities which we enjoy by law; a measure which, while it professes to enlarge the representation of the kingdom on the broad basis of property, would in its practical operation have the effect of closing the principal avenues through which the monied, the funded, the commercial, the shipping and the colonial interests, together with all their connected and independent interests throughout the country, or dispersed throughout our vast empire abroad, have hitherto been represented in the legislature, and would thus in reality exclude the possessors of a very large proportion of the national wealth from all effectual voice and influence in the regulation of the national affairs.

"The silence which the opponents of this project have hitherto felt to be imposed on them by their respect for the authority from which it emanates, so long at least as it was not before them in a defined and tangible shape, having been misconstrued by the ill-informed into an universal acquiescence in its principles and provisions, we deem it a duty which we owe to ourselves, to our country, and to posterity, at the earliest practicable period after the printing of the bill, to protest against it by this public declaration, and to invite our fellow-citizens of all classes, participating in our sentiments, to unite with us in every practicable and lawful effort of temperate but determined resistance to the further progress of a measure which, in our consciences, we believe to be rash and inexpedient in its origin, and tending to consequences equally pernicious and irretrievable, menacing to the peace of the country, fraught with alarm and peril to public and private credit, and calculated eventually to undermine and destroy all those venerable institutions and establishments under whose influence and protection England has hitherto enjoyed a prosperity, and maintained a station, unexampled among the nations of the world." These were the sentiments of an immense mass of the more enlightened orders of society, who had no interest in the existence of corruption, or the perpetuation of abuses; but those who held them were timid and backward, while the reformers, placing themselves by the side of government, were noisy, violent, and menacing. The former had to address the reason of their fellow citizens; the latter had only to flatter their passions. The



former, too, kept back from exhibiting an open resistance, which might be mischievous, and, they believed, would be unnecessary, as they were confident that the House of Commons would never pass such a bill, and that it would be so changed and modified in its progress as to deprive it of the most dangerous parts of its influence. The two parties had now changed places. All the influence of government was on the side of the reformers, whose vagaries and extravagances ministers dared not to discountenance, lest they should disgust or displease them; and one of the most common reproaches directed by the bill-men against their antagonists was that of disloyalty, in daring to oppose the will of the king, and the king's ministers.

The press supplied the daily fuel by which the flame of excitement was kept up. It preached doctrines subversive of all order and government. Not in direct words, but by that indirect style of allusion and remark, which is the most artful of all exhortations, it justified and encouraged every threatened appeal to force. Individuals who distinguished themselves in opposing the change, were attacked with every species of abuse which falsehood can invent and which blackguardism delights to use. The property of the church, and the rights of the peerage were held out as illegally amassed treasures which the people, in the exercise of their due rights, would soon have the pleasure of rifling. Pretended lists of the names of pensioners and placemen were circulated, in which were to be found men set down as receiving large sums of the public money whose fingers had never

touched one farthing from the purse of the state; but to the lower classes they were part of the new gospel of the constitution, and furnished to their more crafty, but less honest, agitators, the texts and the burthens of an hundred discourses. Parliament itself was the object of incessant and abusive attack. Privilege seemed no longer to exist. The Lord Advocate of Scotland had said in his speech, that the members of the House of Commons who sat for boroughs which the bill intended wholly or partially to disfranchise, were interested parties, and disqualified from judging. A London newspaper gave the doctrine a practical application in the following terms:—"When, night after night, borough-nominees rise to infest the proceedings of the House of Commons with arguments to justify their own intrusion into it, and their continuance there, thus impudently maintaining what the lawyers call an "adverse possession" in spite of judgment against them, we really feel inclined to ask why the rightful owners of the house should be longer insulted by the presence of such unwelcome inmates. It is beyond question a piece of the broadest and coolest effrontery in the world, for these hired lacquies of public delinquents to stand up as advocates of the disgraceful service they have embarked in." Sir R. Inglis brought this publication before the House, as a breach of privilege, by moving a resolution, bearing that it was a false and scandalous libel on the House, directly tending to deter members from the discharge of their duty, and calculated to alienate from them the respect and confidence of their fellow subjects. Ministers did not defend the pub-



lication, the Chancellor of the Exchequer admitting that it was a breach of privilege, but they thought it would not be prudent to go too nicely to work in the present excited state of the public mind, and therefore moved the previous question. Sir Robert Inglis, as some members of his own way of thinking seemed to feel coldly towards raising a question of privilege, and thought it would serve a better purpose to show by their votes that such a language was despised, did not press his motion to a division.

It was in this state of the public mind that the second reading of the bill was moved in the House of Commons on the 21st of March. The debate lasted only two days, for in truth the subject had already been exhausted by the seven days debate on the motion for leave to bring in the bill; but it presented some new speakers. It was opened by Sir R. Vyvyan, one of the county members for Cornwall, who moved as an amendment, that the bill should be read a second time that day six months. He declared that the bill affected no personal advantage of his own, for he had no interest, direct, indirect, or contingent, in any borough, and in some points its operation, in so far as he himself was concerned, would rather be beneficial than otherwise; but it was a measure full of danger to the institutions of the kingdom and which, therefore, his conscience bound him to oppose. It proposed to change the influence on which the authority of the House of Commons was founded, and to admit an overwhelming addition of democratic influence, to which, in the course of no very distant time, the authority of the other branches of the state would be compelled to

yield. He would not enter into any abstract question, neither would he contend that the constitution as it stood, should go down from century to century without any modification, or that parliament had not the power to make such changes as it saw expedient; but however he might be disposed to affirm these abstract propositions, he took his stand on the question of the policy of the proposed change, and on that alone he would be justified in voting against the measure. The experience of every country in which the attempt had been made would fully show, that a general reform, which greatly increased the democratic influence, had never been made without producing a revolution, dangerous to the security of property in the country. They were asked, was there to be no change to adapt the constitution to the altered circumstances of the country? They were told of the danger of popular commotion in refusing the demands of an excited people. He was aware of that excitement, and knew how it had been produced. They all knew how the name of the king had been used: they had seen the king's ministers defending the foulest libels on their opponents, till the mob believed, that, in using violence and intimidation, they were only supporting the influence of the monarch and his government. But, in defiance of all this, if asked whether he would run the risk of revolution by refusing reform, his answer would be, this reform is revolution. Every man must lament the circumstances which had pressed forward this desire of change. But what were they, and how would they be affected by concession? One was, that the people saw their property going from them by the



violent change that had been made in our currency. Another was, that at the time when the country was labouring under the most severe distress, the existence of that distress was denied by the late House of Commons. The denial on the part of the late House of Commons of the distress which the country felt so severely was one cause which had produced the cry against tithes, and would produce it against rent. After that denial by the late House, came the general election. That election took place under the influence of the late Cabinet, and one of its earliest votes was that which created the present ministers, he feared for the destruction of the constitution. Yet he heard the noble lord (John Russell) state the other evening, that all that he and his friends wanted was a reform of that corrupt House to which they owed their elevation to office. The declaration of the duke of Wellington against reform, and the changes in France and Belgium, might have had some effect; but he thought that the main causes of the present excited state of the country, and the cry for reform, were to be found in the denial of the distress, and the consequent refusal of inquiry by the late parliament, and the declarations and acts of the present ministry on coming into office. They had come into office pledged to retrenchment, and had found that, in relation to that, they could do nothing. They had come in pledged also to reform. Reform was to effect every thing; and, if carried in the proposed shape, it would undoubtedly effect much, but much to the destruction of the established institutions of the country. Not a word was said about

any change in our monetary system, that system, the adoption of which had been productive of so much distress in the country, —not a word upon that, a proper attention to which might have produced so much benefit to the people. Now he would ask, supposing the ministers able to carry this question, what would be gained? What was it that every man who spoke at public meetings —those who petitioned that House —had cried out for? Retrenchment—reduction of the public burdens. Did the noble lord who introduced this measure believe that by it the government would be enabled to reduce the public expenditure to a greater extent than the noble lord (the Chancellor of the Exchequer) had already stated in his plan of finance? Did he believe that it would add to the prosperity of the people, that it would give a greater power of production, or supply the means of employment to those who sought, and were unable to obtain it. None of all these things would it in any degree effect.

Even if large towns were to be admitted, why so pure a democracy? The bill would lead, in these places, to almost universal suffrage. In Liverpool alone between 15,000 and 16,000 persons would be admitted to the franchise. Would a population vested with such powers stop short at what it had gained? Did the House believe that the ballot would not be carried, and that cutting down the duration of parliaments, to perfect the theory, by keeping parliament at every moment the mere speaking trumpet of the multitude, would not follow? Excitement there was; but that was the sort of influence to



the attainment of which the excitement was directed. He could tell ministers, that, in different parts of the country, the outcry against tithes was at least as loud as the clamour for reform. The animosity against tithes and the established church, which had been first displayed in Ireland, seemed to have travelled into Great Britain; and that part of the press, which was opposed to the institutions of the country, talked about making the first attack on this outwork of the constitution. If tithes were attacked, what security would there be for rent, for the national debt, and funded property? Did any one suppose, that if the House consented, by passing the bill, to declare itself a corrupt and abominable assembly, a reformed parliament would allow those obligations, which a corrupt parliament had imposed on the country, to remain? If any one considered the subject properly, he must see that tithes, rent, funds,—all were involved in the measure. Nor was the danger kept a secret. The apostles of reform were already propagating the doctrine, that rent was a thing created by the state, and therefore might be seized by the state, that it was a tax imposed, and therefore a tax which might be repealed by directing that it should not be paid. Mr. Mill, one of their high priests—one of the men held out as a proper representative in parliament of popular rights and designs, when the omnipotence of the democracy should have been declared by this bill—had laid it down distinctly. Mr. Mill took the fancied case of the legislature by an act of its own, all things remaining the same, doubling that portion of the land which was strictly and properly

rent. In such a case he held it would be both just and expedient to apply to the wants of the state that which the state itself had created, and he thus transferred it from the imaginary case to the real condition of things in this country; “By all those measures which increased the amount of population and the demand for food, the legislature does as certainly increase the net produce of the land, as if it had the power of doing so by a miraculous act. That it does so by a gradual progress in the real, would do so by an immediate operation in the imaginary case, makes no difference with regard to the result. The original rent, which belonged to the owner, upon which he regulated his purchase if he did purchase, and on which alone, if he had a family to provide for, his arrangements in their favour were to be framed, is easily distinguishable from any addition capable of being made to the net produce of land, whether it be made by a slow or sudden process. If an addition made by the sudden process might, without injustice to the owner, be appropriated to the purposes of the state, no reason can be assigned why an addition by the slow process might not be appropriated.” Such were the principles, the assertion of which was to be the recommendation of members of a reformed parliament.

Who can believe, it was asked, that his majesty, whose name had been so abundantly used, and his ministers, themselves among the noble proprietors of the country, would lend themselves to a plan dangerous to the crown, to the aristocracy, and to wealth? But their station only shewed that they did not apprehend such conse-



quences ; and, alas ! Europe had seen kings and nobles as wise falling into that tremendous error. When the notables of France were assembled, they advised the convocation of the states-general, which was, in fact, a reform of the French parliament, and a new set of men then came into power. The double vote was given to the *tiers état*, which presently changed itself into a National Convention. Then came intimidation ; and he called the attention of his majesty's ministers to this part of the case. The most nefarious means were employed to excite the people's minds. Newspapers and pamphlets were published for that purpose, and the whole press was bribed to effect the same object. Persons were paid to read inflammatory publications to those who could not read themselves ; and every means were employed to excite the passions of the multitude against those who were denominated tyrants. These proceedings led on to the 4th of August, 1789, when, upon a single debate, by one vote, and under the influence of panic, the National Convention abolished at once tithes, manorial rights, the right of fishery, the right of chase, or game-laws, which were really only an imaginary evil ; and the patriotic king, the saviour of his country, went to sing a *te deum* for this blessed reform — this happy regeneration. No one was so popular on that day as the king ; and yet that very same king was, within three months afterwards, dragged in his carriage to Paris, and the heads of two of his faithful gendarmes, who had nobly died in defending his person, were paraded before him. Thus was treated the popular sovereign — such was the gratitude shown to the patriot king. There was

no safety to a sovereign in trusting to the passing breeze of popularity. Forced alterations, coming from below, had never had any other effect than revolution. The revolution of 1688 was a revolution effected by the aristocracy, and was regular and orderly ; but what was now wanted was a revolution of the democracy. He had no objection, he said, to give representatives to large and flourishing towns, though he would not go the length of disfranchising at once sixty boroughs, nor would he adopt the arbitrary rule of disfranchisement which ministers had introduced ; and it was his intention, so soon as the bill was rejected, to move a resolution, which would give an assurance to the country that the House was willing to strengthen the representation. He would not presume to offer any detailed plan of reform, but would propose a resolution which would show an inclination on the part of those members who rejected the proposed bill, because it was revolutionary, and had a tendency to destroy the king's authority, to effect what reform was necessary. The resolutions which he should propose would go to the full extent of that which he understood was the plan of Government, before certain individuals made suggestions which induced them to alter it.

The motion having been seconded by Mr. Cartwright, who stated that Mr. Hume had actually written to the radical reformers of Glasgow, entreating them not to say a word about the ballot in the mean time, Mr. Sheil, an Irish barrister, agitator, and rhetorician, whom ministers had brought into the House for Milborne Port, one of the sixty boroughs which were to be disfranchised, repeated the



usual arguments in favour of the bill, adorned with much rhetorical embellishment, but without approaching for a moment the reasonable views of philosophy and experience, by which alone such a proposition could be attacked or defended. Headverted, like those who had preceded him in the argument, to the disfranchisement of the Irish boroughs at the time of the union, and the later disfranchisement of the Irish 40s. freeholders, as justifying in principle every thing that was now proposed, and to the just and deep-rooted discontent which prevailed, as furnishing its complete defence on views of expediency and necessity. It was insisted, he said, that the country prospered—that England, with that fiscal prodigy a debt of a thousand millions on her back, still stood erect and firm—that the expenditure of countless treasure, and the spendthrift prodigality of her life-blood, were not too large a price for freedom—that she might proudly contrast her condition with that of the Continent, and survey the mighty labour of other nations, who were tempest-tost in revolutionary agitation, with a pleasurable consciousness of her own security. To all this he answered, that there existed within herself a settled and general discontent, which was derived from causes of permanent creation, and which, instead of being the mere ebullition of transitory passion, flowed out of a deep and constant source. It was idle to say that it had not long existed, because it had only recently appeared. The sudden force with which it had burst forth, was a proof that the materials of eruption had been long accumulating. It was of little avail to say that it was connected with the events

on the continent. Were we to omit to strengthen our own institutions, because this island had felt the tremor of that great shock which had levelled the governments of France and Belgium to the ground? It was equally nugatory to say that the press had done all this. Would the press relinquish its natural vocation? and was it not much wiser to consider, instead of inveighing against its influence, the materials in the shape of abuses, upon which it exerted its powerful operation? Was the discontent well founded? That was the main question—almost the only one. This single broad fact was, in his mind, sufficient to call forth the national repudiation of the House of Commons—that its majority was returned, not by the people, but by 150 individuals. Some four or five great proprietors of boroughs were enabled to control the minister, and by their oligarchical coalition to dictate to their sovereign, and to lord it over the people. That such a system should exist was a great calamity in itself, but the evil was heightened by many sordid accompaniments. Seats in parliament were made the subject of bargain and sale, and an almost open mart—a common staple—a parliamentary bazaar, was established for the vendition of the franchises of the people: a parliamentary broker was a customary phrase; nay, matters had been carried to such a pitch, that boroughs had been made the subject of marriage settlement, and had been put, by the ingenuity of conveyancers, through all the diversities of matrimonial limitation. The House had all heard that a sultana, on her marriage, usually had one province awarded to her for her neck-lace, another for her bracelets,



and a third for her girdle: under the system of parliamentary proprietorship, it would be no matter of surprise to see a lady of fashion receiving Old Sarum for pin-money, and Gatton for her dower. The people thought it a perfect mockery to call this a national representation; and, instead of seeing in members of parliament the mirrors of the public mind, they beheld in them pocket glasses, in which the images of a few great nominators were faithfully reflected. By these means the moral as well as the political interests of the country were affected. The notorious sale of boroughs generated a general habit of venality. When lords transmuted their interest in parliament into money, by what an easy process of imitative alchemy the humbler voter would convert his miserable suffrage into gold! How could we condemn bribery in the one, when we gave it a countenance in the other? Was the grossness of the prostitution palliated by the largeness of its wages? and was the enormity of the offence in the inverse ratio with the magnitude of its remuneration? He admitted that a splendid catalogue, an emblazoned muster-roll of genius, had been produced by the advocates of the borough system as one fruit of its operation. Mark, however, over what a vast space they were dispersed—in how black a firmament they sparkled! and was it not very remarkable that so many of these illustrious persons, who were cradled in close boroughs, and who preserved their political soundness, although they were nursed by corruption, were themselves opposed to the very system to which it was alleged that they owed their parliamentary existence? What would be said of

Chatham, Dunning, Pitt, Fox, Sheridan, Grattan, and so many others? Try this case, not by the votes of the living, but by the votes of the dead: enter the sacred repository within whose echo the House deliberated—count the graves of the illustrious men who were opposed to reform, and of those who were its advocates, and on that division it would be found, that the majority of sepulchres was in its favour? But even if he were to admit that they were against it, and that the House would lose the chances (for they were but contingencies) of receiving men like them through the medium which was the theme of so much panegyric, yet what would be the loss, compared with the certain deprivation of the public confidence?

Mr. Sheil treated as ridiculous the idea that this bill could be dangerous to the crown or the aristocracy. It gave fifty-five new county members. From what class were they likely to be selected? Would they seek to build their fortunes out of the ruins of their country? Members were to be given to large towns: would their inhabitants show no regard to opulence—to hereditary dignity, to ancient neighbourhood; and, instead of looking for representatives amidst noble demesnes and venerable halls, would they accept every wandering knight-errant of sedition, and itinerant visionary in codification? There was a singular variance between the logic of the non-reformers and their sarcasms. They spoke of Tavistock with emphatic signification. They meant that the influence of the house of Bedford would continue. If so, why should not the influence of other great families continue elsewhere? Thus their syllogisms



were overthrown by their satire, and their arguments evaporated in their vituperation. This bill would wrench their despotism from the oligarchy, but it would not touch the legitimate influence of property, and birth, and station, and all the other circumstances which create a title to respect. It would take power from individuals, and give it to a class. It would cut off the secret and subterraneous conduits through which aristocratic influence was now conveyed to that House, and would make it flow in a broad, open, constitutional, and natural channel. Away with the charge that it would weaken the monarchy. The throne would be built on the confidence of the people, and find new pillars in the nobility; and, so far from the crown being loosened on the head of the king, the diadem would be fastened by another band on the royal brow.

Mr. Charles Grant, one of the disciples of Mr. Canning and Mr. Huskisson who had resisted to their last breaths such a change as this, followed on the same side, stating various considerations why reform should be granted, but not stating how any one of them had risen to his mind, till, after having been the friend of many Tory administrations, he, and the knot of his companions, had been transmuted into the members or the partisans of a Whig government. He might now assume, he said, that the question of reform and anti-reform had at last fairly fallen to the ground, for scarcely one, who opposed ministers on the policy of their proposition, had been induced to stand on the principle of anti-reform. When the hon. baronet opened the debate of the present evening, he had certainly expected

that he would intrench himself in some impregnable position; but that expectation was at once set at rest by the assurance, that the hon. baronet himself entertained a plan of reform, which he did not, however, think fit to divulge to the House. In the necessity of some such policy all who were now in opposition professed to agree. The question, therefore, was no longer one of reform, or no reform; that was absolutely decided. The only points at issue were, what should be the nature of the reform, and when it should be proposed. No public man who had, with an observant eye, regarded the state of the country for the last four or five years, could be blind to the fact, that the subject would be soon forced upon the attention of parliament, and that the time would, ere long, arrive, when a decision would be inevitable, perceiving that the present sentiments of the public were grounded on a principle, of the truth of which they were convinced. Public opinion, properly so called, was never to be disdained in a free country like this; and it should always form a main element in the deliberations of such an assembly as the House of Commons. During the last fifteen years much had been done to open the way for parliamentary reform, but that which chiefly conduced to its advancement was, the removal of the prejudice which taught, that affection for the constitution ought to resist any attempt at the amendment of its acknowledged defects. The progress of knowledge had removed a fatal barrier to improvement, and the late Home Secretary had already shown, that a regard for existing institutions was perfectly compatible with an enlightened



perception of their defects. A firm but reverential hand had lately removed even the sacred veil of British justice, and the ecclesiastical establishments of the country had likewise received the advantages which a liberal policy alone could impart. An enlightened people complained that their rights were invaded, that the interference of the two other branches of the legislature was directly condemned by the standing orders of the House of Commons, yet that the constitution was rendered a dead letter by the habitual violation of those rules—an infraction of which was nevertheless held to be a high contempt of the privileges of the Commons. What answer but one could they offer to an unanimous and indignant nation thus expostulating at their bar? They were desired not to yield to intimidation, and this had also been the language held to the duke of Wellington on a former occasion; but he would rather say, delay not concession until it shall be wrested from the legislature as a right, not received as a boon. The tone of the opponents of reform was far from conciliatory. Was not the country told that those evils, of which all complained and sought the abolition, were beauties, not deformities, and had contributed to the splendour and prosperity of the empire? The people, however, were happily too enlightened to be so easily deceived; and it was therefore to be hoped that those who could suggest no more specious argument would abandon their opposition. So far from thinking that the state of Europe ought to have deterred ministers from proposing this measure till the political agitation of our neighbours should have subsided, he thought the present

moment peculiarly opportune for the interests of the cause of reform, and trusted that the decision of the House would prove at once gratifying to the people and honourable to themselves.

The Solicitor General said, that the whole argument against the bill seemed to proceed on the assumption that there was something in the British constitution inconsistent with change, and that to make an alteration would be nothing less than to effect its complete destruction. But the history of this country, and its institutions, shewed that there had been an almost uninterrupted series of conflicts between the principle of democracy and despotism, with alternations of success, and the inevitable consequence of that, a system of perpetual change. The present bill was, therefore, in every point of view, in perfect harmony with the whole current of our legislation. He believed that, with respect to the period antecedent to the revolution of 1688, there would be no difference of opinion. In six years after the Revolution, the triennial act was passed, distinctly admitting, on the part of the legislature of that period, that the Revolution was not a settlement to be permanently unchangeable; neither was the triennial act itself treated with undeviating respect, for, in the year 1715, its repeal was sanctioned by some of those identical statesmen who brought about the Revolution itself: then the septennial act was passed, and another great change effected in the constitution of parliament. Did any one, at that period, hold that the septennial bill was a revolutionary measure? So far from any such character being imputed to it, the



measure had always been treated as one within the constitution of parliament to enact. It must even be in the recollection of many members, that attempts had been made to disfranchise corrupt boroughs, which was never held to be an attempt beyond the legitimate powers of parliament ; yet, in his opinion, a general and sweeping measure of reform would be infinitely preferable to such occasional disfranchisements, for he conceived that nothing could be more dangerous to the liberties of the state, and the interests of justice, than to mix oftener than absolute necessity demanded, the legislative with the judicial functions. The borough of Cricklade had been disfranchised in 1781. Some of the voters were tried for corruption, and convicted ; others were tried and not convicted ; others were not even tried. The last two classes were entitled to be considered as innocent persons ; yet they were punished, for the House disfranchised the borough, proceeding upon a principle of general expediency, not so much to inflict penalties for what was past, as in order to prevent abuses for the future. Now, with regard to the boroughs to be disfranchised by the bill, although there might not be legal proof, there was moral certainty, that they were the subjects of sale. The members whom they returned, represented, not their constituents, but the nominee, or the seller. Of that mode of election the people of England complained, and the government had determined, as it was bound, to remedy it. The complaint had grown, till every member must feel, that the House was already under an external pressure as strong as was consistent with the law, or the public peace ; and if they did

not satisfy the expectations which had been raised, that pressure would become so strong as to endanger the tranquillity of the state.

Sir Edward Sugden, to whose office the solicitor-general had succeeded, complained, that the latter had gone back to the bill of rights, instead of attempting to explain and justify the provisions of this bill of wrongs. The septennial bill, it was perfectly true, did not spring from the Revolution. It was brought in by Whig ministers, for the same purpose for which the present bill was brought in by Whig ministers—as the only means by which they could retain their places. Then as now, they took possession of popular ferment to retain their power. It was imprudent, forsooth, according to the solicitor-general, to mix up the legislative with the judicial functions ; yet he proposed that the legislature should at once pronounce sentence on all the boroughs, and that, too, on something called moral evidence.

The bill itself, and the reasons, which must be imagined, for none had been given, for its capricious and arbitrary provisions, he professed himself unable to understand. England was to be deprived of sixty-two members. Why that ? Who had petitioned for that—what outcry had been raised for that ? What excitement had been raised against the numbers of the House ? Why this, when population was daily increasing ? There were multitudes unrepresented, and why not give them these sixty-two representatives ? The adoption of population, too, as the rule, led to strange results. In one place there was only one house sufficient to give a title to vote. They were told the bill



would increase the power of the aristocracy, and yet every one of its friends declared, in the same breath, that its great object was, to protect the people against the aristocracy. How was this to be understood, or did ministers themselves know what they really meant? Mr. Sheil maintained the power of the aristocracy would be increased, because there would be a great number of additional county members? This would be intelligible, if the bill had done this, and nothing else; but taking this along with all the other provisions of the bill, he would again ask Mr. Sheil, or any other man, to state intelligibly what was meant by saying that it would increase the weight of the higher classes of society in the representation? Moreover, the members returned for counties would not resemble those who had hitherto represented them. As the freeholders in cities and towns were not to vote, county members would be returned by a smaller constituency than that of many towns, losing in individual weight while they were increased in aggregate number. Would the members for Yorkshire stand equally high in that House, and in the country, when the constituency was reduced, by depriving all the freeholders of Leeds, Huddersfield, Halifax, Wakefield, and other large towns, of the right of voting for county members? and such freeholders were excluded, while copyholders and leaseholders were admitted.

The power which was to be given to the crown, of sending forth itinerant committees of the Privy Council, to portion out the constituency of England, he strongly condemned, as being utterly inconsistent with the principles of the

constitution. It was a power which the king might exercise or not, as he pleased, or rather as the government might be pleased to advise. The constitution had never given such authority to any body of men; and he knew nothing in the conduct of the present ministers to entitle them to so large a confidence. He objected likewise to the mode of ascertaining the validity of claims made to be registered. The judge of assize was to nominate a barrister, and this nomination was to be confirmed by the lord chancellor. This was a most extraordinary power to vest in the lord chancellor. A barrister, under the influence of the Chancellor, was therefore to decide what was to be the constituency of the country. The barrister was declared liable to a civil action, but this proved that he was intrusted with a power open to abuse.

Mr. Pendarvis, the colleague of sir R. Vyvyan in the representation of Cornwall, warmly supported the bill. He stated, that it would deprive that county of two-thirds of its members, yet the inhabitants had already shewn by their petitions that they were willing to make this sacrifice, because they were convinced that the change would be for the benefit of the county, as well as of the country in general. Mr. Cavendish, one of the members for the university of Cambridge, declared his intention of voting for the bill, although his constituents had petitioned against it; many of them, he stated, not being hostile to the whole measure, approving, for instance, of the disfranchisement of the decayed boroughs, but objecting to the new qualification as being too low. Mr. Ward, on the other hand, one of the members



for the city of London, the Common Council of which had petitioned in favour of the bill, strenuously opposed it. He had been entrusted with a petition signed by 600 merchants, bankers, and others, against the bill. The signatures to it, he said, were those of men qualified to judge, independent, and having much at stake in the country. He agreed with them, that there was no one practical good to be accomplished by this measure, to atone for all the positive mischief and certain danger which it would produce; and unless it could be shown that the parliament to be called into existence by the new scheme would minister to the wants of the people in a greater degree than that which now existed, every thing which had been said in its favour must fall to the ground. He had passed the earlier years of his life principally in two close boroughs, and among the representatives of those boroughs had been, during his remembrance, Mr. Fox, Mr. Pitt, Mr. Canning, Mr. Perceval, the noble lord at present at the head of Foreign Affairs, and the duke of Wellington. Such had been the representatives of those close boroughs, and he very much doubted, if by a reformed system more able members would be given to that House; indeed, the country would be fortunate, if as good were returned. Again, when he first entered that House, he naturally looked at both sides to see who were the most influential members. On the ministerial side he saw Mr. Canning, the right hon. baronet lately at the head of the Home Department, and Mr. Huskisson—all of whom had been members for close boroughs. On the opposition side of the House, he found

the most influential members to be the present lord high chancellor (then Mr. Brougham), Mr. Tierney, and the right hon. baronet the member for Knaresborough (sir J. Mackintosh), all of whom were at that time members for close boroughs. Such was the case, and fortunate would it be, if large and populous places always found and returned men of such abilities. On the other hand, in his experience but three members had been called to account by that House in consequence of their conduct. It mattered not whether that conduct had been right or wrong; into that question he did not go—he merely stated a fact; and those members were the hon. baronet, the member for Southwark; the hon. baronet, the member for Westminster; and lord Cochrane, and all three members were the representatives of populous places. Thus he had found upon examination, that during his time, on the one hand, the only members who had been called to account for their conduct by the House were the representatives of populous places; while, on the other hand, the most influential members on both sides of the House had sat for close boroughs. Still, it was said, however eminent and useful may be the members returned for close boroughs, they are not the representatives of the people. But what was meant by the term representative? Was the physical force of the country to be represented, or was the good sense of the country to be represented, or were the passions of the people to be represented? On the good sense of the country he had great reliance—on the passions none. And if there was a moment when the passions of the people were



more liable to excitement than an other, that moment was the period of an election. If upon such an occasion the passions were moved in behalf of a particular candidate, whatever might be the character of his pretensions, up he went to the top of the poll. A person so returned was not at liberty to exercise his own judgment. He was necessarily but the echo of the passions of those who had sent him there. Philosophers had found out, that by certain mixtures of metals a compound was formed which was perfect to all known uses; but he had yet to learn, that any one had ever discovered what proportion of the feeling and the passions of the people ought to be represented in that House, or to be allowed to act upon it. He objected to the bill, therefore, upon these grounds; but the strongest reason he had for giving his decided negative to it was the fact, that that which the people principally desired, had in a great degree, been already enforced. The people required relief from taxation, and retrenchment. Since the commencement of the peace, 31,000,000*l.* of taxes had been repealed. The country was often reminded of the remaining 50,000,000*l.* of taxes, but it had never been sufficiently made acquainted with the fact, that 31,000,000*l.* had been removed. As to patronage and retrenchment, it was right the people should attend to the expenditure of their money; but while so much was said about sinecures and pensions, it ought not to be forgotten, that during the last nine years, 4,000 places or pensions had been abolished, fifty-eight of which had salaries attached to them of from 1,000*l.* to 3,000*l.* a year. Of these facts the public had not been

sufficiently told. He could not admit, then, that the Parliament had not done its duty. On the contrary, he contended it was impossible for it to have been more assiduously or more beneficially employed than it had been.

Among the other members who delivered their opinions, several stated, that although they would vote for the second reading of the bill, they were not prepared to go all the lengths to which it went, and hoped to see it modified in the committee. Sir Thomas Acland declared, that the disfranchisement was a great deal too sweeping, but he would not resist the second reading. The most startling announcement was that of the change of opinion in Mr. Calcraft, paymaster of the forces under the late administration. In the debate on the motion for leave to bring in the bill, he had expressed the most unqualified disapprobation of its principles. He now astonished both sides of the House by declaring that he intended to vote for the second reading.

The House at length divided. Including the Speaker and the four tellers, there were 608 members present, the largest number that had ever divided on any question in the House of Commons. On the division, the numbers were, for the original motion 302, for the amendment 301; the second reading of the bill being thus carried by a majority of one, in the fullest House of Commons that had ever been assembled.

This division was a defeat of the ministers in substance. The populace, indeed, who knew no better, believed that a victory had been gained; in many places illuminations were called for and ordered, in celebration of the imaginary



conquest; and the mob vented its vengeance on the houses of all citizens who would not join them to do honour to the triumph of the reform bill, at the very moment when it virtually had been lost. In Edinburgh, where the most respectable part of the city was in darkness, the mob was allowed to traverse the principal streets for hours undisturbed, and to destroy, to the extent of several thousand pounds, the windows of those citizens who differed from them in opinion regarding the merits, or the prospects, of the ministerial measure. Ministers themselves could labour under no delusion, and could now entertain no expectation of carrying through their bill with the existing House of Commons. Parliamentary history presented no example of a ministry even attempting to proceed with a measure, the principle of which had been carried by so insignificant a majority; and no measure that a ministry had ever presented could compete in importance with the one which was now in question. But even if they brought themselves to be satisfied with the quantity of support that had barely sufficed to send their bill into a committee, they not only had no security that they would be able to maintain it essentially unaltered in that committee, but they had the means of knowing that there they would fail. The principle of reform, as embodied in this bill, had been carried only by a majority of one; but the numbers forming the majority contained many who had already expressed their determination not to support all the provisions of the bill. There were many more who, too timid to resist the principle, were equally resolved to modify the measure in the

committee, although their intention was not declared. The majority contained many of the moderate reformers; and they looked to the committee as the place in which the bill was to be changed to something very different, while they escaped, or thought they escaped, the odium of appearing to reject all alteration. Ministers had no reason to believe, that, on the very first division in the committee, on the clause, for instance, for disfranchising the sixty boroughs, they would not be left in a minority; and they had voluntarily placed themselves in a situation in which they could concede nothing that would meet the views of any one of their opponents. In forming their plan, they had gone farther than even their own original intention. Lord Grey stated in the House of Lords, on the 28th of March, that "the first disposition of his mind undoubtedly had been to limit the reform within a much narrower compass;" and all who had ever heard lord Brougham's opinions on reform, had not yet recovered from their amazement that such a scheme should ever have received his sanction. Having gone so far, they had pledged themselves, again and again, to stand or fall by this individual bill; "and we are committed to it heart and soul," was the language of their leader. By going so far, and binding themselves never to recede, they gained, in the meantime, at least, the support of the radical and extreme reformers, the most noisy and threatening portion of the population, and the only one to which, if they spoke rationally, they could ever refer, as the probable sources of those dreaded convulsions which supplied so much of their logic in



support of the bill. They had thus shut the door against all compromise. They had pledged themselves, not merely to the principles of disfranchisement, enfranchisement, and uniform qualification, but to those degrees of disfranchisement and enfranchisement, to that special rate of qualification, and to those special, though confessedly arbitrary lines of distinction, which were to be found in this particular bill. Any modification in committee would to them, therefore, be as fatal as a defeat on the principle; and as it did not well appear how they could hope, after the last division, to carry the bill through a committee, without important modifications, it was believed that they must either resign, or execute the threat of dissolving parliament, with which they had prefaced all discussion. No one expected that they would adopt the former expedient; but the general opinion awaited the second. Ministers themselves, however, had determined otherwise, and resolved to try their fortune in the committee, which was delayed till the 18th of April.

In the meantime, the bill for Ireland was brought in, and it merited at least equal consideration with the bill for England, from the immense change which it would produce in the relative situations of the Protestants and Catholics. The bill was brought in by Mr. Stanley, the Irish Secretary, on the 24th of March. Passing by any discussion of the principles or expediency of the ministerial projects, he came at once to the detail of their application to Ireland. In the first place, the right of voting for counties would be left to freeholders, as they already stood, but leaseholders of 50*l.* a-year, under

leases for twenty-one years, would be added to them. Clergymen, likewise, were to vote, not as beneficed clergymen, but as freeholders, if they were freeholders to the extent of 50*l.* Of copyholders nothing was said, there being only one copyhold estate in Ireland. Householders who occupied a house let at the yearly rent of 10*l.*, or which, if let to a solvent tenant, would yield that rent, were to vote for the towns or boroughs in which they resided. The bill, however, was not to interfere with any existing right of suffrage in cities, towns, or boroughs, while the present possessors lived; but, on their extinction, the franchise was to be limited to the 10*l.* householders.

The machinery was to be much the same with that proposed for England. The Privy Council was to settle the limits of boroughs; lists of electors in counties and towns were to be made up by the churchwardens, or, where there were no such officers, by a person to be named by the lord lieutenant, and disputed claims were to be decided by the assistant barrister. In each county, fifteen places were to be appointed for polling; not more than 600 voters were to poll at any one of them, and the poll was not to be kept open longer than two days.

The necessary result of the measure would be, to take the franchise out of the hands of the corporations who had hitherto monopolized it, and the propriety of doing so, Mr. Stanley thought, could not be denied by any person who compared the small number of voters with the population of the places for which they elected the members. Thus, Armagh had between 8,000 and 9,000 inhabitants; Bandonbridge upwards of



10,000; Belfast more than 37,000; Carlow, 8,000; Ennis, 6,700; Sligo, more than 9,000; Tralee upwards of 7,500; and yet in each of all these places, the number of voters was denoted by the same mystic number, thirteen. Some of these towns, as well as other places, were daily increasing in population, wealth, and intelligence; and government, therefore, proposed to give to each of four large towns an additional member. These four were Belfast, with 37,000 inhabitants, Waterford and Galway, with each 28,000, and Limerick with 59,000. The English bill made no change in the election of the members for the Universities; but an alteration was to be made in regard to the university of Dublin. In future it was to return two members instead of one, and the number of electors was to be increased, by bringing back the right of voting to what it originally had been. By the original charter, the right was given to the provost and scholars, and the election was to take place "*juxta formam Universitatis Oxoniensis et Cantabrigiensis.*" At Oxford and Cambridge, the Masters of Arts had always voted; but in Dublin, a subsequent charter having excluded scholars from receiving their *stipendia* after the expiry of five years, it had been held, by a forced construction, that they lost their right to vote for the University member, after the same period, though they still continued to be scholars. The present bill would restore the original right, by extending the academic franchise to all persons who, at any time, had been scholars of the University, provided they placed their names on the books, as claimants of the right, within six months after the passing of the act. Min-

isters had likewise adopted one part of a bill introduced by colonel Trench, enacting, that where a person held two freeholds, each under 10*l.*, but equal to that value when taken together, he should be entitled to vote as for one 10*l.* freehold.

Mr. O'Connell (whom sir C. Wetherell designated as the member for Ireland) admitted, that the bill would be a great boon to Ireland, and would produce a very effective constituency; but there were parts of it which he hoped would be altered, as they implied no departure from the principle of the measure. In the first place, a greater number of members ought to have been given to Ireland. The increase was to be five, and Scotland was to receive five. But the population of Scotland was not much more than 2,000,000, while that of Ireland was 6,800,000; therefore, if Scotland deserved five, Ireland deserved three times five. Dublin, too, ought to have more members, especially as Edinburgh was to have two; its population, including the limits of the county of the city of Dublin was not less than 250,000. The north part ought to have one member, and the south part two. He objected, likewise, to the arrangement concerning the University, because it still left to the franchise an exclusive character. No Roman Catholic could have a vote there, for he could not become a scholar of that Protestant University. The scholarships, therefore, ought to be thrown open to Catholics as well as Protestants, and the right of voting extended to Masters of Arts. Neither did the Irish counties receive all the justice which they deserved. Many counties in England, because their population exceeded 200,000, were to receive



two members each ; while, in Ireland, there were twelve counties, with a population above that point, whose representation was not to be increased. This he hoped would be considered in the committee, and with this hope he expressed himself satisfied with the measure. It was one for which the people of Ireland would be thankful ; it would satisfy their minds ; and hereafter persons who might desire to effect other changes would find themselves mistaken. He himself was one of those who had thought that certain other changes were necessary for Ireland ; but he owned that, if this bill passed, the necessity for such changes would no longer exist.

To the demand for opening the University scholarships to Catholics, and making all Masters of Arts voters, the Irish solicitor-general announced, that the charter did not allow it. The right stood on a different footing in Dublin from Oxford and Cambridge. In the latter, the charters gave the right to the Masters ; in the former, only to the Fellows and Scholars. Now it was the principle of the bill to preserve vested rights and settled institutions, so far as could be done consistently with an efficient reform. To admit the masters, would bring in a body of 5,000 electors. Under the bill, the constituency would be increased from 300 to 400. To admit the masters, moreover, would introduce Catholics ; and government thought that the University voters ought always to be Protestants, since the charter had been granted for the avowed and exclusive purpose of promoting the Protestant religion. To open the scholarships to Catholics would be still more inconsistent with the charter. That was a

part of the constitution of Trinity College with which ministers did not intend to interfere. In truth they interfered with no part of it ; but merely restored it to its true and original meaning, freed from a comparatively modern innovation.

Mr. Bankes, sir C. Wetherell, and sir H. Hardinge, argued, that the giving of additional members to Ireland, no less than to Scotland, was unjust towards England ; and inconsistent, in this respect, with the fundamental principles of the two legislative unions. If any one thing in these unions was intended to be more permanent than another, it was the relative proportion of the numbers which each country was to send to parliament. An addition was now to be made, though not a large one, to the representation of Scotland and Ireland, while that of England was diminished. If the latter were to be reduced, so ought likewise the former, in order to maintain the proportions established at the union, and the number of members for Ireland, instead of being raised to 104 or 105, should be brought down to 84 or 85. The inviolability of the numerical ratio and aggregate sum of the representatives of the three countries, had been laid down, over and over by the advocates of the Catholic question as an argument against those who contended that the admission of Catholics to civil power would be fraught with danger to existing institutions. Such was the line of argument urged by Mr. Pitt, by Mr. Fox, and by Mr. Windham, that, the numerical aggregate being inviolable, the infusion of a few Catholic members could not affect the Protestant excess of the entire body of representatives in that House.



All this was now to be changed ; and sir C. Wetherell stated, that he would bring the point before the committee in the distinct form of a resolution, that the lopping off sixty-two English Protestant members, while they were adding to the Irish and Scotch representation, was fraught with danger to the interests of the established church in this country.

A still more important consequence of this bill, they said, was to be found in its sure effects upon the Protestants of Ireland. It so happened, that five sixths of the property in Ireland belonged to Protestants, while about the same proportion of its population were Catholics. It would be perfectly impossible, if this bill passed, for an Irish Protestant to be returned to parliament, unless two-thirds of the Catholic population chose to vote for him. The number of voters for Dublin was, at present, about 6,000 ; the operation of this bill would increase them to 18,000, of whom 14,000 would be Catholics. What man, then, could expect that the House would ever again see a Protestant representative of Dublin ? At the time of the union with Ireland it had been fixed, that, while seventy-six places were to be popular representations, twenty-four boroughs were expressly reserved in order to protect the Protestant interests ; and they had been called close boroughs, and had been treated as such, in all the debates on that subject. But by the operation of the bill, there would scarcely be a borough in which the voters would not be in the proportion of two Catholics to one Protestant. This was a virtual exclusion of all Protestants from the representation of Ireland ; not one of them would get into parlia-

ment unless he became an agitator, pledged himself to all that was demanded, and basely pandered to the passions and views of the Catholic electors.

The chancellor of the Exchequer answered, that the bill did not interfere with the unions, any more than the union with Ireland had violated the union with Scotland ; for, by the former, the aggregate of members to which forty-five for Scotland had been fixed on as a fair proportion, was increased by no fewer than 100, brought from Ireland. That was a complete change in the proportions. As to the different circumstances in which Protestants in Ireland would now find themselves, his only answer was, that he and his colleagues entertained no apprehensions of their opponents being able successfully to raise against them a no-popery cry. The public mind was now too enlightened to be affected by such idle clamours.—The bill was brought in and read a first time, the second reading being fixed for the 18th of April.

When the House met, on the 12th of April, after the Easter recess, lord John Russell communicated to it certain alterations which it had been found necessary to make in the schedules of boroughs to be disfranchised, in consequence of inaccuracies in the population returns of 1821, on which the whole plan had been founded ; thus shewing, that no small degree of crudeness had entered into its concoction, and proving the necessity of diligent and careful inquiry into each individual case. He mentioned that ministers, after fixing on the census of 1821, had addressed letters to the returning officers of the boroughs, to ascertain whether the limits of the



borough continued to be the same as at the time of taking the population in 1821. They likewise had given, and would give, the most anxious attention, to any memorial from any particular place, pointing out errors in the returns, and they had likewise carefully considered the petitions from particular places which had been presented to the House. There were, then, four data on which they meant to proceed in ascertaining the number of inhabitants in different boroughs :—1. The original population returns ;—2. The corrected population returns ;—3. Memorials laid before the Secretary of State, by persons well known, complaining of inaccuracy in the existing returns ;—and 4. The petitions presented to the House on this subject. Carefully looking to all the documents, ministers hoped that they would be able to make an efficient correction, with reference to the places contained in the schedules A and B : so that a fair and equal course should be adopted with respect to the different boroughs concerned. There was, for instance, before the House, a petition from the burgesses of Buckingham, shewing very clearly that certain parts of the town of Buckingham were not contained, as they ought to have been, in the population return—and which, if added to the existing return, would, they believed, raise the population to 3,000. The whole of this statement was so particular and so clear, that it contained, in his opinion, sufficient reasons for taking the borough of Buckingham out of schedule A. Again, with respect to the borough of Truro, a memorial had been presented to the secretary of state, which would also be laid before the House,

showing, that the whole population of the town of Truro was not fairly represented in the returns of 1821. On the other side, a memorial had been presented from the town of Guildford, stating that it contained a greater number of inhabitants than was set forth in the returns. That document averred that some streets, which ought to have been included in the returns, were omitted. The memorialists did not, however, state what part of the town those streets were situated in, neither did they say what was the total amount of the population, according to their view, in 1821. Under these circumstances, unless some other petition was presented to the House, or a different or more explicit memorial was laid before the secretary of state, it would be impossible to omit Guildford from the schedule B. He thus gave notice to such boroughs as could make out a clear case, that their population had been under-rated, and that they contained more than 2,000, or more than 4,000 inhabitants in 1821, in order that they might apply, in proper form, to the House. With respect to taking the population, in relation to the borough or parish, ministers thought it right to adopt the same rule with regard to all boroughs ; because, in many places, it was impossible to distinguish the borough from the parish, especially when the parish bore the same name as the borough. The whole bill had, during the recess, been maturely considered by his majesty's ministers. They had examined it most attentively, to see whether they could make any improvement in it. With regard to the wording of the bill, considerable alterations had been made, but nothing what-



ever had been done to alter the principle of the measure as it had been originally laid down.

Ministers, also, further explained their views upon another point, their declarations regarding which became of importance from what followed. According to their plan, as it had been opened by lord John Russell, the number of members in the House was to be reduced by sixty-two; and this reduction was to fall exclusively upon England. The only reason urged for it was, that the numbers were too great for the efficient performance of the public business. This was too general and arbitrary a reason to satisfy many even of their own friends; and the reduction acquired a more serious air from the fact, that, in all likelihood, every member from Ireland would in future be a Catholic. Lord John Russell, therefore, declared, that although ministers had not changed their opinion regarding the propriety of reducing the numbers of the House, and would try to carry through that opinion, still "they were not prepared to say, that this was a question of such essential and vital importance, that, if the feeling of the House were strongly shewn in a desire to keep up the present number, they might not be induced to relax their determination on that point. If it should appear to be the sense of the House that the whole number of 658 members should be retained, the government would not feel that they were altering a vital or essential part of the measure by agreeing to that proposition." On the 13th of April, Mr. Stanley, when adverting to the same topic, to prevent any misconception that ministers, though they might consent to retain the numbers, would leave

them to the boroughs, stated, that they were determined to adhere, in all circumstances to the total disfranchisement of every borough whose population did not reach a particular standard, and the partial disfranchisement of every borough falling beneath a certain other standard. But if it were the feeling of the House that the numbers would be unnecessarily or extravagantly reduced by this bill; and if it were deemed proper by the House that its numbers should be farther augmented beyond what was contemplated by the bill, then that augmentation should not be the means of restoring those disfranchised boroughs, but the number of members to be added should be given to such great, populous, and important towns as might be considered to have, in that event, a fair claim to representation. Mr. North having observed, that as the measure, in its original shape, gave five members to Ireland, and took sixty-two from England, the retention of those sixty-two members was a change which would materially affect Ireland, Mr. Stanley rejoined, that he had not said a word of any intention of government to retain the sixty-two members: all he had said was, "that if the House should be of opinion that the number should be continued, government would recommend that they should be given to large bodies." And the chancellor of the Exchequer said, "as to the exact number of members which should constitute the House, ministers do not hold it to be essential to the principle of the bill; though they are determined to carry the measure with respect to numbers if they can. But if it should be the opinion of the House that the present number was not too



great, and if it should decide to retain the whole, ministers would not think it such a deviation from the principle of the bill as would induce them to abandon it. On the contrary, they would then be prepared to recommend to the House the manner in which those members should be disposed of; adhering to their original principle, that no members should sit for boroughs which came within the line of disfranchisement which they had felt it their duty to draw. The members thus to be disposed of, should the House so decide, they would recommend to be given in many cases to large towns, but in all to large bodies, adhering as much as possible to that balance of interests which was at present kept up in the country; but he begged to be distinctly understood, that the retaining the whole number of members was in no one degree to touch that principle which went to the disfranchisement of the rotten boroughs. If, after the government had proposed the number of

which they thought the House ought to consist, the House should compel ministers, by a division, to increase that number, then they would take in populous towns, or populous bodies of constituency, and bestow the elective franchise on them." These declarations could not be misunderstood. The only reduction of members proposed by the government was, the cutting off sixty-two members from the representation of England; no proposal to prevent that reduction could have reference to any thing else; and they had declared that they would not consider a successful proposal to avoid that reduction any encroachment on the vital and essential parts of the bill; while they were perfectly right in saying, that to retain the sixty-two members, for the purpose of restoring them, in whole, or in part, to the decayed boroughs, was a very different measure, to which they never would accede.



## CHAP. IV.

*Alterations in Reform Bill subsequent to the Second Reading—Motion that the House go into Committee—General Gascoyne moves that the existing number of Members for England and Wales shall not be diminished, which is carried against Ministers by a Majority of Eight—Nature and Effect of the Division—Lord Wharncliffe gives notice, in the House of Peers, of a Motion for an Address to the King not to Dissolve—In the Commons, a Motion of Adjournment, pending the Ordnance Estimates, carried against Ministers—Scene in the Commons on the 22nd of April—In the House of Peers, Lord Wharncliffe's Motion interrupted by the entrance of the King to Prorogue Parliament—Prorogation and Dissolution—Case of Privilege in the House of Lords, connected with the Press.*

ON the 18th of April, lord John Russell moved, that the House should resolve itself into a committee on the reform bill; and stated the alterations which was made upon it in the mean time. These were not inconsiderable. Five boroughs had been transferred from schedule A to schedule B, and allowed to retain one member, and seven of those in schedule B, were allowed to retain their two members, in consequence of its having been ascertained that the population returns had not accurately represented the number of their inhabitants, or that the returns themselves had been misunderstood.\* On the other hand, eight members were to be added

to the following counties, having a population from 100,000 to 150,000 inhabitants:—Bucks, Berks, Cambridge, Dorset, Hereford, Hertford, Oxford, Glamorgan. Seven members were added to the following large towns:—Oldham, Bury, Rochdale, Whitby, Wake-

---

Boroughs to be withdrawn from schedule B and return their present number of Members:—

Leominster	Truro
Morpeth	Westbury
Northallerton	Wycombe
Tamworth	

Towns to be placed in schedule D, to have one member:—

Bury	Stoke-upon-Trent
Halifax, taken from	Salford
Schedule C	Wakefield
Oldham	Whitby
Rochdale	

Counties to have an additional member each, undivided:—

Berks	Glamorgan
Bucks	Hereford
Cambridge	Hertford
Dorset	Oxon

---

\* *Amendments proposed in the Reform of Parliament Bill, by lord John Russell.*

Boroughs to be withdrawn from schedule A and placed in schedule B:—

Aldborough (York)	Okehampton
Buckingham	Riegate
Malmesbury	



field Salford, Stoke on Trent (Potteries), while Halifax was restricted to the township, and to return only one member, the parish being twenty-five miles in extent. Sons of freemen, entitled to the privilege of freemen, on their coming of age, born before the introduction of the bill, and apprentices, having entered into indentures in the same manner, were to retain their franchise, on taking out their freedom, being resident, and registered under the provisions of the bill.

General Gascoyne moved as an instruction to be given to the committee,—"That it is the opinion of this House, that the total number of knights, citizens, and burgesses, returned to parliament for that part of the united kingdom called England and Wales, ought not to be diminished." His motion, he said, was not founded on any superstitious attachment to a particular number, but was directed against the principle of the reduction. Neither was it founded on any hostility to an increase of the representation of Ireland and Scotland, but to their aggrandizement at the expense of England. Let Ireland and Scotland obtain their additional members, but let it not be at the expense of England. The proposed reduction of the English representation could not be defended on any principle of necessity, or justice, or expediency. It could not be defended on the ground of the population of Ireland having increased so much as to warrant such an increase of the relative number of its representatives in that House; for, if population were taken as the basis of the Irish representation, it ought also to be taken as the basis of the Irish taxation. That it was not

so was plain, and had been urged as an argument in favour of the legislative union with Ireland by Mr. Pitt. At that time the population of Ireland amounted to 4,200,000 persons—the taxation was 4,600,000*l.*; while the population of England was 10,700,000, and the taxation 27,700,000*l.* At present Ireland did not contribute more than one-tenth of taxes in proportion to its population as compared with this country, so that, if population were taken as the ground for adding to the representatives of that country, it ought also to be made the basis of a more equal taxation. What would be the feelings of Ireland and Scotland, if the bill proposed to add to the English representation at the expense of the representation of Ireland and Scotland? And was England to be stripped of her relative share without remonstrance? Were they blind to the unanimity with which the representatives of Scotland and Ireland resisted every plan, emanate where it might, which tended to equalize the burthens of the state in all parts of the united kingdom? In the divisions on the property tax, on the assessed taxes, on the spirit duties—in fact, on every new impost whatever—the Irish and Scotch members always voted so as to throw the weight of the taxes off their own shoulders on the people of England; and yet here was a proposition which took from the English representation and added to that of Scotland and Ireland. Did they forget that ministers were compelled to exempt Scotland and Ireland from the operation of the metallic currency bill, in consequence of the opposition of the members of those countries?—that eighty-three out



of 100 Irish members came to a resolution to oppose ministers altogether, if they persisted in depriving Ireland of its small-note currency, and that they succeeded in their object? Look how the Irish members contrived to throw the burthen of supporting their own poor on this country, as indeed they would every other burthen, if the relative superiority of the representation of this country were destroyed, as the bill intended. Ireland might, if the House so pleased, receive an increase of members, but let them not therefore diminish the number of English members. If the bill were altered so as to transfer the franchise of the boroughs in the schedule A to places in England, he should not object to it; but if it were retained in its present form, he would offer it every opposition in his power.

The motion was seconded by Mr. Sadler, who delivered a long, argumentative, and learned speech against the general principles of the whole plan of reform; and he was immediately followed by the chancellor of the Exchequer, who declared he was quite sure that the object of the amendment was, "to destroy the bill." The proposition now made was not merely, he said, that the members of the House should be kept as they were, but that they should either be increased, or that Scotland and Ireland should not receive the additional members proposed to be given them by the bill. It was impossible to misunderstand the nature of this amendment. It was the first of that series of motions by which it was intended to interfere with the progress of the committee, and which, if agreed to, would be fatal to the bill, or, at least, so detri-

mental to it, as to render it impossible it should be proceeded with. It could not proceed from any dread of danger to England; for the members for Britain would be to those from Ireland as five to one.

The debate was adjourned till next day. By far the greater portion of it was occupied with discussions on general principles, which had already been argued to satiety, and in attacking and defending the changes which ministers had introduced into the bill since the second reading. Very little of it was devoted to the precise point in dispute, and still less to the new point raised by the chancellor of the Exchequer, that to agree to the amendment would be to defeat the bill. Of the members who opposed it, some did not see how it could be considered hostile to the principle of the bill, even if it were carried; and not one, except ministers themselves, pretended it would be a good reason for abandoning the bill, every essential part and principle of which remained untouched. Mr. Bulwer, who supported the bill, thought that this question regarding the number of members, would make no difference in the general character of the measure. Mr. J. Campbell, on the same side, though he saw no good reason against reducing the number, still hoped the bill would go on, though the amendment should be carried. Mr. Wynn, who was opposed to the bill, and had resigned office because he was opposed to it, to whom the plans and intentions of government had previously been communicated, and who must have known what they deemed important, and what not, did not consider this motion of much consequence one way or another. Sir George War-



render, though opposed to the bill, would resist the amendment, on the idea that the effect of it would be, in the event of the bill going on, to prevent the giving of additional members to Scotland. Sir George Clerk said, he, too, would vote against it if he could anticipate that such would be its result, but he could see no reason why England should not retain its members, and yet Scotland get its five. Even sir Robert Wilson, a member for Southwark, so much of a reformer as to be almost a demagogue, was utterly astounded at the view which ministers, after all that had passed, chose to take of this amendment. He said, that, from the first moment the measure had been broached, he had been opposed to that part of it which went to diminish the number of members, convinced as he was, that parliament would soon be called on, rather to add to the representation as the people increased in wealth and intelligence, and that a contrary principle was opposed to reform. Accordingly, on the very night the proposition was first broached, he communicated his misgivings to some members connected with the government, and had with them a confidential communication, the result of which was, that he was led to believe that ministers did not consider the proposed reduction as an essential portion of their measure of reform, but as a suggestion for improvement in the machinery of that House, which they thought would be worthy of adoption. He also was induced to believe, from his confidential communications with certain gentlemen, whom he had reason to regard in the light of organs of the government, that the reduction formed no essential part

of the measure of reform; and that, therefore, though he might oppose the former, it did not follow, but he might, as he would, vote for the latter. What had been said by lord J. Russell and the chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 12th and 14th instant, confirmed him in this view, for both distinctly stated, that ministers would bow to the decision of the House on the question of reducing the entire number of its members—they individually being favourable to a reduction. Judge, then, of the amazement with which he had heard the noble chancellor of the Exchequer stigmatise the proposition of the member for Liverpool, as insidiously and mischievously designed against the main measure of reform, and that to vote for it would be to declare himself an enemy of that measure. In voting for this amendment, he was not voting against increasing the representation of Scotland or Ireland, for it had never yet been explained how that increase was irreconcilable with preserving the integrity of the representation of England, nor did he believe that the fate of the bill depended, in the slightest degree, on the success or the failure of the present motion.

Mr. Stanley threw out against the amendment a torrent of abuse, and declared, that this discussion would decide the fate of the bill, without uttering one sentence to shew how it ought to have that effect. He described it as being concocted in a spirit of hostility to the bill, brought forward to embarrass "the great measure," cautiously framed, after much deliberation, so as to catch the greatest number of votes, and continue to defeat, under the flimsy pretext of a discussion of the relative propor-



tions of the English Scotch, and Irish representatives, a proposition which they did not dare to oppose openly ; but Mr. Stanley did not deign to show how one of these effects was to follow, or to explain in what sense, and in what way, a vote not to diminish the number of English members, was a vote trenching on any one principle of his bill : and a simple recurrence to the ministerial majority of one, on the second reading, would have taught him the value of his remark, that the antagonists of the bill did not dare to oppose it openly. However, “he warned those hon. members, who, while they professed themselves friendly to reform, supported this amendment, that it would decide the fate of the bill, and that by their votes on this occasion they would be judged by their constituents, and by the country ; that in voting on this question they would be considered as voting either for or against reform ; that in now giving their votes, they would vote either for or against the carrying of that question, for the carrying of which, if now lost, an opportunity so favourable might not again soon return, and that the result of that night’s division would be, either to carry that great question, or to defeat the highly raised and fondly excited hopes of the people of this country.” There was determination here—determination of ministers to abandon the bill, merely because they chose to abandon it if they were defeated in even the most unimportant matter ; but there was no reason why they should do so on any other ground than the *stet pro ratione voluntas*. Accordingly, sir James Graham added, “he did not say that, if this amendment was carried, ministers

would abandon the bill ; but he did say, that if the amendment were carried, it would be a matter of very grave consideration to ministers, whether the bill had been so impugned that they ought not to attempt to carry it through its other stages ; and he therefore warned the friends of the bill not to concur in the amendment.” Sir James seemed to feel the necessity of attempting at least to show how the success of this amendment would affect the principle of the bill, and he asked, “if they were not to reduce the number of members in England and Wales, how were they to carry the principle of the bill into effect?” that principle being the disfranchisement of decayed boroughs, and the enfranchisement of more populous and flourishing places. But this only increased the darkness ; for his colleagues had already declared, that, in their opinion, the retention of the number of members had nothing to do with the distribution of these members, and that they would find ways and means to dispose of all the sixty-two, if the House decided on retaining them, without departing from the great principles of their bill. General Gascoyne had some reason for expressing his surprise at being now told that his motion to keep these sixty-two members was inconsistent with the essence and principle of the bill. He stated, in his reply, “if I understood right, the noble lord who brought in the bill, in a conversation which I had with him only yesterday, (this was said on the second day of the debate,) he distinctly admitted to me that my amendment would not touch the principle of the bill.” His lordship answered, that the amendment now moved was different from that



to which general Gascoyne had alluded a week before ; but he said nothing as to what had taken place the day before ; and, like the rest of his colleagues, while he hinted that, ministers, if defeated on this division, would have recourse to a dissolution, he left the House in profound darkness as to the only question before it, viz., how does the keeping up of the number of English representatives interfere with the essential principles of the bill ? On the division, there was a majority of eight against ministers, the numbers being, for the original motion 291, and for general Gascoyne's amendment 299.

If ministers had said, that the result of this division against them would convince them of what they ought to have seen from the moment that the second reading was carried, viz., that the committee would not be under their management, and that they had no more confidence of success in regard to essential parts of the bill, than in regard to this question which they had declared not to be essential, they would have laid at least an intelligible ground for refusing to proceed with the existing House of Commons. It was not, indeed, a ground which they could have pleaded with a good grace ; because they had foreseen the probability of an attempt being made to retain the sixty-two members ; they had announced their determination to oppose it ; they had anticipated the possibility of an unfavourable division ; and had declared that, in that event, they would bow to the decision of the House. They could not, therefore, without a total change of plan, and a departure from all their declared intentions, make that result, when it did arrive, a cause of quarrel. But they

placed themselves in a still more awkward situation, by selecting, as the pretext of quarrel, an alleged character of the amendment, inconsistent equally with fact and reason, and with their own repeated declaration, that to keep the numbers of the House undiminished, would not trench on the principles of the bill. They might say, indeed, that they had always spoken of the members of the whole House, while the amendment was confined to the members for England ; so that they could not act upon it, and, at the same time give five additional members to Scotland, and five to Ireland, without increasing the present number of the House by ten, to which they never had agreed. But it was impossible that the House of Commons, in the previous conversations which had taken place regarding the keeping up the numbers, could have supposed any other members to be meant than those for England. It was from England alone that they were proposed to be taken ; distinct reference had been made to "the sixty-two members," described by Mr. O'Connell as forming the bank on which they might draw ; it was England alone which had paid them in ; and men anticipating an attempt to prevent the reduction could anticipate it only in regard to that quarter in which the reduction had been threatened. But even on the assumption that ministers had contemplated only the possibility of keeping the numbers of the whole House at 658, and not those of the English members at 513, what did it end in ? They had declared it would be no infringement of their principles to keep all the 658 members ; they would distribute the sixty-two according to their



principles. They had already disposed of about twenty of them by the alterations made in the bill between the second reading and the motion for going into a committee. The remainder were in their hands, to be disposed of in the same way. By this vote they were to be all retained for England: but how did that affect any principle of the bill? It could do so only if it prevented them from giving the additional ten members to Scotland and Ireland. Even in that case, they had never declared it to be an essential principle of their bill, that the proportions of representatives from the three countries should be altered. How could it be essential to reform, not merely to give Scotland and Ireland new members, but to give them at the expense of England? How could the substance and usefulness of their plan for purifying parliament be touched, by applying it to 668 members instead of 658? Thus they so managed matters as to place their quarrel with the House of Commons on this narrow and untenable footing, that, if they complied with the vote, they would have to add ten members, for the purpose of supplying the deficiencies of Scotland and Ireland. They admitted, that the House might consist of 658 without any impeachment of their own principles; and it is not surprising that not one of them attempted to show how the ten members more would infuse corruption into the whole scheme—and that was the point to which their own conduct and declarations had brought their case. If parliament was dissolved on account of this vote, it would be dissolved—not because it had refused to disfranchise totally, or partially, the boroughs which had been

marked out for partial or total condemnation—not because it had refused to give more members to large counties, or extend the rights of election to places which had hitherto been unrepresented—not because it had rejected an uniform qualification, or had raised it to a rate higher than the ministerial standard—not because it had spurned any one of the great principles or arrangements by which this bill was to call into existence a reformed and renovated House of Commons; but solely because it had expressed an opinion, which, taken in conjunction with the sentiments of ministers, would have required that this reformed and renovated parliament should consist of 668 members instead of 658. So little did the country expect this, that the most influential journals of the reformers spoke of the division, next morning, as an advantage gained.\*

Ministers themselves did not yet seem determined to put their case on this footing. The division took place on the 19th of April. On the 20th nothing transpired in the House of Commons regarding their designs. Mr. Hume, however, declared, “that he would offer no opposition to the ordnance estimates because, after the vote of last night, he was anxious to assist ministers in getting through the necessary business, in order that a dissolution might take place. Running neck-and-neck as parties were in the House, it was delusion to suppose that the reform bill

---

\* The Times of April 20th said, “general Gascoyne’s motion, though meant in opposition to ministers, and springing from a Tory, will have the singular effect of increasing the number of places possessing popular representations. It is giving the reformers more of a good thing than they wanted.”



could pass in the present parliament." On the 21st, Lord Wharncliffe, in the House of Lords, alluding to certain reports in circulation, put the question to Lord Grey, whether ministers had advised his majesty to dissolve parliament, and whether it had been resolved that that course should be adopted? He put the question, he said, because, if he received a certain answer, it was his intention to adopt some measure in relation to that subject. Lord Grey replied, that he declined answering the question. Lord Wharncliffe then gave notice that he would next day move an address to the king, praying that his majesty would be graciously pleased not to exercise his undoubted prerogative of dissolving parliament. On the same day, Sir R. Vyvyan asked ministers in the House of Commons, whether it was their intention to proceed with the reform bill, or whether they would advise his majesty to dissolve parliament because the House of Commons would not consent to reduce the number of English members? Lord Althorp replied, "that he had no hesitation in answering one of the questions, and to say, that ministers having considered the necessary consequence of the division of the House the other evening on the bill, it was not their intention to proceed farther with the bill. It would not be consistent with his duty to answer the second question." There immediately arose a long and irregular debate, in which much was said, on both sides, regarding the propriety of a dissolution, and still more upon the general merits of the reform question; but although the members who supported the propriety of a dissolution, agreed that there was no likelihood of the bill passing

uninjured through the present House, the ground which ministers might have taken—not one of them maintained that the vote of the 19th was in itself any infringement on the great principles of the bill—the ground to which ministers had narrowed themselves. The debate, or rather discussion, having been continued till half-past one in the morning, an adjournment till next day was moved from the opposition side of the House. It was strenuously resisted by the chancellor of the exchequer on the ground that the topic which had occupied so much time, was not a question before the House, and that he wished to get on with the report of the committee of supply on the Ordnance estimates. The house divided, and ministers were left in a minority of twenty-two.

Ministers it was clear, had now to decide on more than the reform question; they had to struggle, not merely for their bill, but for their places. Lord Wharncliffe's motion stood for discussion in the House of Lords next day; that discussion they determined to avoid by dissolving parliament in such haste that there was scarcely time for making the necessary preparations. When the House of Commons met on the 22nd, the presenting of a petition connected with parliamentary reform, furnished occasion for another discussion on the projects and conduct of ministers. Sir R. Vyvyan inveighed with great earnestness against the desperation with which they were believed to be urging on a dissolution in the present state of the country, but as that dissolution was every moment expected, there reigned in the House a confusion and disorder which St. Stephen's



Chapel had never witnessed, since Cromwell ordered "the bauble" to be removed from the table, and the House to be locked upon the members. Even the authority of the Speaker, so soon to expire, did not retain all its usual weight. Sir Francis Burdett having called Sir R. Vyvyan to order, the Speaker declared that the latter was not out of order, and requested that members would in the mean time take the law as he had laid it down. Mr. Tennyson insisted notwithstanding this decision, that the baronet was not in order. Again the Speaker declared that he was, and Mr. Tennyson, amid tremendous calls of chair, exclaimed that he would maintain the baronet had been out of order "even though the Speaker should gainsay it." The noise and confusion increased, and the sound of the artillery announcing his majesty's approach, was but a new source of excitement. Sir Francis Burdett and sir Robert Peel rose together. The latter began; the former continued standing, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer appeared at the same time on the floor, moving that sir Francis should be heard. The Speaker himself with difficulty obtained a hearing. He had called, he said, on sir R. Peel, who first caught his eye; and lord Althorp immediately rose, as he had a right to do, to put the question that sir Francis Burdett should be now heard. He apprehended that it was according to the orders and rules of the House, that the hon. baronet (sir R. Peel) had a right now to speak on any matter before the House. Having said this, he should only further observe, that when hon. members called on him to decide on questions of order, and he had endeavoured to give his opinion

impartially and satisfactorily, it was not perfectly consistent with the respect which was due to the chair to proceed farther with the matter. Sir R. Peel went on: "These were the rules under which that House had hitherto acted, although they might not be the rules that would suit a reformed parliament. He, for one, would never agree to set at defiance that authority (as had that day been done), to which the House of Commons had long been accustomed to bow. He did not, he was happy to say, share in the desponding feelings of his hon. friend, the member for Cornwall. He did not desire the people of England to sit quietly, with their hands before them, patiently expecting the confiscation of the funds, and the destruction of tithes. He had that confidence in the power of the property and the intelligence of this country, that if they would unite in the support of a just and an honest cause, he did not despair of a successful and prosperous issue to their joint exertions. If their reformed parliament was to be elected,—if "the bill, the whole bill," were to be passed,—it did appear to him that there would then be established one of the worst despotisms that ever existed. They would have a parliament of mob demagogues, not a parliament of wise and prudent men. Such a parliament, and the spirit of journalism, to use a foreign phrase, had, as they must have seen, brought happy countries to the brink of destruction. At that moment, society was wholly disorganized in the west of Ireland; and that disorganization, he was grieved to say, was rapidly extending elsewhere. Landed proprietors, well affected to the state and loyal to the king, anxious to



enjoy their property in security, were leaving their homes to take refuge in towns, abandoning the country parts, as no longer affording a safe residence. At this critical conjuncture, instead of doing their duty, and calling for measures to vindicate from the visitation of lawless and sanguinary barbarians the security of life and the safety of property, his majesty's ministers, anxious only to protect themselves, and fearful of the loss of power, were demanding a dissolution of parliament. Alas! he already perceived that the power of the crown had ceased. It was no longer an object of fair ambition with any man of equal and consistent mind to enter into the service of the crown. Ministers had come down there, and had called on the sovereign to dissolve parliament, in order to protect themselves. But they had first established the character of having shown, during their short reign of power, more incapacity, more unfitness for office, more ignorance of their duties, than ever was exhibited by any set of men who had at any time been called on to rule the proud destinies of this country. After having accused their predecessors, during the last two years, of having done nothing — of having expended much time in useless debates — not one single measure had they themselves perfected. What had they done in the last six months? They had boasted much of the good, which, by acting on liberal principles, they would produce. But what had they done — where were their works to be seen? They had laid on the table certain bills — the emigration bill and the game bill, for instance, founded on their so much boasted liberal principles, — and what then? — why,

there they had left them." At this moment the Serjeant-at-arms knocked at the door, and the usher of the black rod summoned the Speaker and the members to the House of Peers, to hear the prorogation of parliament.

In the House of Peers, the proceedings had scarcely been more orderly or satisfactory. The order of the day was lord Wharncliffe's motion for an address to his majesty against the dissolution. His lordship had uttered only a few words, when the duke of Richmond rose to complain, that all the peers were not sitting in their proper places, as was usual on such occasions. This being dissented from, his grace insisted that he would enforce the standing order, "that their lordships should keep their places, and, likewise," as he observed, "persons present, who were not members of that House," he would move that they should be ordered to withdraw. Noise and confusion ensued, amid which a peer was heard to say, that ministers were taking the crown off the king's head. His grace of Richmond would then move another standing order, "that against the use of abusive language," while the marquis of Londonderry denied that any offensive language had been used, "though the noble duke seemed to think himself the hero of this *coup d'état*, and to be able to smother the expression of their lordships' sentiments on this most extraordinary occasion." Lord Wharncliffe, being at length allowed to proceed, stated, that without wishing to provoke a discussion on the subject, he was anxious that it should be entered on the journals of the house, that he in his place yesterday did give notice that he would move an



humble address to his majesty not to exercise his undoubted prerogative of dissolving parliament. His lordship then moved, "that an humble address be presented to his Majesty, humbly to represent to his Majesty, that we, his Majesty's most dutiful and loyal subjects, the Lords spiritual and temporal in Parliament assembled, think ourselves bound in duty humbly to represent to his Majesty, that alarming reports of an intended dissolution of Parliament have gone forth: that, dutifully acknowledging the wisdom of the constitution in trusting to the Crown that just and legal prerogative, and fully confiding in his Majesty's royal wisdom and paternal care of his people, for the most beneficial exercise of it, we desire, with great humility, to represent to his Majesty, that it appears to us that a prorogation or dissolution of Parliament at the present juncture, and under the present excitement of the public mind, both in Great Britain and Ireland, is likely to be attended with great danger to his Majesty's Crown and dignity, and to every institution of the state, by preventing that calm and deliberate consideration of any question tending to the reform of the representation of the people, which the importance of that subject so especially requires." The Lord Chancellor exclaimed, "My lords, I have never yet heard it doubted, that the king possessed the prerogative of dissolving parliament at pleasure, still less have I ever known a doubt to exist on the subject, at a moment when the lower House has thought fit to refuse the supplies." His lordship having uttered these words, in relation to an address which expressly

recognised the prerogative, and at a moment when no human being was casting a doubt upon it, hurried out of the House to receive his Majesty, whose near approach was now announced, and Lord Shaftesbury being called to the woolsack, amid such discordant noises as the peers had never witnessed, succeeded in restoring some degree of order. Lord Mansfield then addressed the House. Such a scene as this, he said, he had never before witnessed in their lordships' House, and he hoped never to see any thing like it again. He had heard from the noble and learned lord on the woolsack, with the utmost surprise, that the House of Commons refused the supplies. The noble and learned lord had, indeed, perhaps with wilful ignorance, declared this to be the case. He would use no intemperate language, but he would nevertheless assert, as far as God Almighty gave him the means of understanding, that the Crown and the country were now about to be placed in a most awful predicament, unparalleled at any previous period. He would not accuse his majesty's ministers of any evil intentions, but he did accuse them of weakness and incapacity, of conspiring together against the safety of the state and the dignity of the Crown, by acting in such a manner upon such a question. He had not stated his opinions generally on the Reform Bill, because it was not before the House, and he really was always of opinion that the bill would never come there, and that it would necessarily end in a complete and entire abortion. He would assert that a ministry more distinguished by incapacity than the present had never before existed. This preci-



pitate dissolution of parliament was one of those precious things suggested by the factions existing in this country. It was certain that a plan of reform had been brought forward by ministers, which they never hoped to carry into effect, and which they had presented to parliament like mendicants for popularity, merely for the purpose of redeeming their inconsiderate pledges. He was always ready, as a peer, to give his advice to the king, and if interested views were attributed to him for doing so, in reference to this question, he should not complain, well knowing, as he did, that similar imputations had been already cast upon much more worthy persons. He felt a pleasure in stating to the House the advice which he had tendered to his majesty on this subject. He had stated to his majesty, that if he should be unfortunately advised to the adoption of that measure, and that if, with a view to the revival of the bill, he should give his assent to a dissolution of parliament, it was a measure so pregnant with danger, that he was certain, though he could not predict either the manner or the gradations of the attack, that an attack would immediately afterwards be made upon the credit of the country, on the national debt—then upon the privileges and the very existence of that House—and, at last upon the privileges and the very existence of the crown itself—those privileges which the crown held not for its own benefit, but for the happiness and interests of the people with which it was so intimately connected.

Further discussion was interrupted by the entrance of the king. The House of Commons having been summoned, his majesty pro-

rogued parliament with the following speech:

“My Lords and Gentlemen;

“I have come to meet you for the purpose of proroguing this Parliament, with a view to its immediate dissolution.

“I have been induced to resort to this measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people, in the way in which it can be most constitutionally and authentically expressed, on the expediency of making such changes in the representation as circumstances may appear to require, and which, founded upon the acknowledged principles of the constitution, may tend at once to uphold the just rights and prerogatives of the Crown, and to give security to the liberties of the people.

“Gentlemen of the House of Commons;

“I thank you for the provision you have made for the maintenance of the honour and dignity of the Crown, and I offer you my special acknowledgments for the arrangements you have made for the state and comfort of my royal consort. I have also to thank you for the supplies which you have furnished for the public service. I have observed with satisfaction your endeavours to introduce a strict economy into every branch of that service, and I trust that the early attention of a new Parliament, which I shall forthwith direct to be called, will be applied to the prosecution of that important subject.

“My Lords and Gentlemen;

“I am happy to inform you, that the friendly intercourse which subsists between myself and Foreign Powers affords the best hopes of the continuance of peace, to the preservation of which my



most anxious endeavours will be constantly directed.

“My Lords and Gentlemen ;”

“In resolving to recur to the sense of my people in the present circumstances of the country, I have been influenced only by a paternal anxiety for the contentment and happiness of my subjects, to promote which, I rely with confidence on your continued and zealous assistance.”

The Lord Chancellor then declared parliament to be prorogued to the 10th of May. Next day appeared the proclamation, announcing the dissolution, and directing a new election. The writs were made returnable on the 14th of June.

The dissolution was celebrated in many places by illuminations. No authority can prevent persons from illuminating who think proper to do so ; an illumination not general only lights the populace to the destruction of those who refuse to join it ; a small number of persons of one opinion can always compel a great number who differ from them to illuminate — more especially if party spirit or weakness induces a magistrate to lend them the sanction of his authority. The lord mayor authorized an illumination in London. The consequence was, that, in the west end of the town, the unrestrained rabble vented their fury on the houses of individuals, peers and commoners, who had expressed sentiments unfavourable to the Reform Bill. Among them were those of the duke of Wellington and Mr. Baring, the one the first of British warriors, and the other the first of English merchants. In political disputes, to place candles in windows is no proof of political opinion, or of any thing else than a

prudent desire to avoid the outrages of a mob. But these illuminations were made use of by the reformers to keep up their incessant cry, that the inhabitants of the country, from one end to another, were animated by one universal feeling of enthusiasm for the Reform Bill, and for the act which got rid of a parliament that would never have passed it.

If it was the consciousness, that nothing had yet happened in regard to the Reform Bill which could justify ministers in adopting the resolution to dissolve, that led the Lord Chancellor to place that resolution on the ground of an alleged refusal of the supplies, his lordship was not more fortunate than his colleagues. He referred, of course, to the adjournment of the House of Commons on the 21st, or rather on the morning of the 22nd, when the ordnance estimates were among the orders of the day. No one vote had been refused, or even questioned ; no man had made any allusion to the supplies ; ministers were not entitled to invent, for the adjournment, a meaning which no person entertained, or to say that supplies, which they could have got on Friday or Saturday, but which they did not attempt to get, were refused because the House did not go through all its orders on Thursday. But the conclusive answer lay in this, that the dissolution must have been resolved upon before the debate, which terminated with the adjournment, began. It began with lord Althorp's statement, on the 21st, that ministers had determined not to proceed with the bill. If they had then come to that determination, they had determined to dissolve ; for neither they, nor any of their partisans, ever



pretended, that, pledged as they were, they could possibly remain in office, if they either abandoned reform, or receded from any part of their bill.\*

One of the last acts of the House of Peers was to vindicate its dignity in a question of privilege, connected with the intemperate abuse which the press was daily pouring forth against bodies, as well as individuals, who chose to entertain their own opinions on political questions. In a conversation in the House of Peers, the earl of Limerick had expressed himself unfavourable to the establishment of a compulsory provision for the poor in Ireland. Next day (April 16th), the following paragraph appeared in the Times newspaper: "Mean, cruel, and atrocious as every civilized mind must consider the doctrine that Ireland has no need of Poor-laws, or some equivalent for them—

hateful and abominable as is such a screen for inhumanity—there are men, or things with human pretensions, nay, with lofty privileges, who do not blush to treat the mere proposal of establishing a fund for the relief of the diseased or helpless Irish with brutal ridicule, or almost impious scorn. Will any man credit that an Irish absentee lord could say what he is reported to have uttered in the House of Peers last night, when lord Rosebery presented a petition, praying that a compulsory tax on land might be introduced into Ireland towards alleviating her poor? We shall not name him, because the House of Lords is armed with a thing called a bar, and other disagreeable appendages; but there are members of that House who surprised nobody by declaring their indifference to popular odium, especially when they are at such a distance from Ireland as to en-

---

\* This assertion of lord Brougham, the only minister who made it, called forth next day the following public statement, in the shape of a letter to the Editor of the Times, from Mr. S. Perceval, a member of the House of Commons: "In your paper of to-day, the lord chancellor is made to assert that the House of Commons had stopped the supplies. Now if any person made such an assertion, he uttered a direct and unqualified falsehood. The House simply adjourned at half-past one o'clock on Thursday night, upon the motion of Mr. William Bankes, which was opposed by lord Althorp. It is just as rational to say that in so adjourning they threw out all the bills pending before them in the orders of the day, as to say that they stopped the supplies. It has been the common practice of Mr. Hume and others to oppose any vote of money after twelve o'clock, and however inconvenient an obstruction of business this was felt at any time, no one ever dreamt of the absurdity of accusing him of stopping the supplies. Undoubtedly the

---

motive for the motion of Mr. William Bankes was, that ministers should not get forward with their business that night, but why? The case stood thus—the rumour of intended dissolution was general; ministers, when questioned, refused to declare their intentions: it was known that a notice had been given in the House of Lords for an address to the throne not to dissolve; and the intention of Mr. Bankes and of the House of Commons was simply to afford the opportunity for that debate, or rather not to help forward government on their road to dissolution before that debate could take place. True it is, that the supplies are stopped; but by whom? By his majesty's ministers, who had chosen thus precipitately to dissolve parliament, rather than face the discussion in the Lords—rather than suffer the loyal and faithful expostulation of the peers of the realm to reach the royal ear, which royal ear, if your report be correct, is approached by a man who scruples not at falsehood to serve the purpose of the moment."



sure the safety of their persons." On the 18th, the earl of Limerick brought the matter before the House as a question of privilege, stating there could be no doubt that the paragraph applied to him, as he was the only peer who had spoken on the occasion, except lord Rosebery himself, who presented the petition. The question being put, "that the paragraph was a libel on the House, and a breach of its privileges," the lord chancellor said, that if the motion were persisted in, he could not oppose it, but it appeared to him that it would not be prudent to proceed farther in the matter. He must state, in the way of earnest and not injudicious, and, he trusted, not unacceptable advice, that all such courses as that on the brink of which they now stood, brought their lordships into very painful dilemmas, and ended in regrets that they had ever been embraced. The whole result of all his experience, whilst he had held a seat in another place—a place in which complaints of a similar description were much more frequent than in their lordships' House—was, that without any one exception, in no case was a step taken of such a description as that now proposed, without their afterwards repenting of it. He did not see any occasion to strengthen the privileges of the House in the way now proposed. If there were a clear and undoubted case of offence—if there were a plain and manifest infringement of the privileges of their lordships' House—if there were an indisputable outrage—an outrage manifest to the House itself—no man could doubt that it was a fit subject of investigation at their lordships' bar, and no

man could hesitate to say that it was in their lordships' power to deal with such an offence in the way which they might think necessary for the defence of their privileges, and the support of their dignity. If, however, the conduct of a noble lord was made the subject of an attack by the press or otherwise, he could only observe, that, in citing the offender to the bar, he got into great difficulties by the rules of proceeding, and by the privileges of the House in their strict letter as they now stood." The earl of Limerick, however, and the House, having shewn no disposition to allow the matter to drop so easily, his lordship expressed a hope that, if the noble earl did "drag" them into such a proceeding, their lordships would adopt a prudent, moderate, and temperate course. The earl of Limerick answered, "I wish to 'drag' no one into this proceeding. I consider myself the guardian of my own honour; I am determined to protect my honour, and I conceive it my duty to bring before the House that which I look upon as an insult to their lordships. The noble and learned lord has referred to the first part of the paragraph as the worst; now I, as an Irishman, would refer to the concluding sentence of it, in which it is meant to be conveyed, that I have hazarded in this House an opinion which I would be afraid to express elsewhere."

The motion having been unanimously agreed to, the printer of the Times was ordered to appear at the bar next day. Mr. Lawson, the printer of the paper, having accordingly appeared (April 19th), and admitted that he had printed the paper containing the paragraph in question, was in-



formed by the lord chancellor, that their lordships had determined that paragraph to be a false and scandalous libel, and were ready to hear any thing which he might have to urge in his defence. Mr. Lawson expressed "his regret, that there should have appeared in the newspaper, of which he was the printer, any paragraph calculated to give offence, either to their lordships in general, or to the noble earl in particular. Their lordships must be aware that, owing to the rapidity with which a journal like the Times must be printed, and the multiplicity of articles which necessarily found their way into it, it was almost impossible for him, using every diligence in his power, to peruse every separate paragraph which appeared in the paper. The paragraph, of which their lordships complained, had found its way inadvertently into the paper, and he had only to repeat his deep regret that it had done so." Several questions were then put to him by some of their lordships, through the lord chancellor, who informed him, that he was not bound to answer them, unless he pleased, though, at the same time, their lordships would form their own opinions regarding his reasons for declining to answer. He was asked, whether he had the supreme control of the paper of which he was the printer? He replied that he had not. He was then asked, if he knew who had? He replied, that he considered himself to be holding a confidential situation in the Times newspaper-office, and that he therefore could not answer that question without a breach of trust to his employers, and a loss of character to himself. A noble lord then asked whether a gentleman, whose name he men-

tioned, was not the editor of the Times newspaper? Mr. Lawson replied, that this was only another mode of putting to him the last question, and, therefore, with all respect to their lordships, he must decline giving any answer to it. —To a question, whether he was the person whose name was entered as the printer at the Stamp-office, he answered in the affirmative. Certain questions were then put to him respecting the proprietors of the paper, whose names were entered at the Stamp-office; but his reply was, that he did not know who they were. The printer having been ordered to withdraw, lord Wynford suggested that he should pay a fine of 100*l.*, and be committed to Newgate till it was paid.—This was resisted by the lord chancellor, the duke of Wellington, the marquis of Lansdowne, and earl Grey. It was agreed and carried, that Mr. Lawson should be committed to the custody of the Usher of the Black Rod, and attend their lordships next morning.

When the House met next morning, Lord King presented a petition from Mr. Lawson stating, "your petitioner feels the sincerest regret at having given offence to the right honourable House, and to the earl of Limerick in particular, and craves pardon for the same; and humbly begs, in consequence of his acknowledgement of his error and regret, that he may be set at liberty." The feeling of the House seemed to be, that the petitioner should be reprimanded and discharged; but as fine and imprisonment had been mentioned, the lord chancellor threw doubts on the power of the House to inflict such a penalty. "That I should ever agree," said his lordship, "to fine



a man 100*l*. and commit him to Newgate for six months, for a breach of privilege such as this, is altogether impossible. I must first have this question of your lordships' privileges debated at length. I must open up the question of the right of the House to imprison for six months and inflict a fine—it may be of 10,000*l*. on an individual, tried by no jury, and defended by no counsel, because a noble lord may complain of his feelings being injured by a newspaper paragraph. Why, my lords, if such a principle were to be admitted, one noble lord would complain of one newspaper, another would direct your attention to a breach of privilege in a second, and the practice might be extended till your lordships' house would be converted into an inquisition instead of a court of justice. My lords, before I can admit such a principle, I must have this matter argued; and if any noble lord thinks it a mere motion of course, that the king's subjects shall be sentenced to imprisonment and fines, he is very much mistaken, and will find, that every time such a thing shall be proposed, he and I must meet and battle first the point of law, secondly, the point of privilege; and if, upon these points, the right of fine and imprisonment be established, then we must dispute the point of justice to the public, of humanity to the individual, and of prudence and discretion in your lordships." Lord Wynford said, it was a mistake to say he had proposed fine and imprisonment. "I proposed that what another noble lord threw out on the subject of fine should be adopted; and, as usual in all such cases, that the party should be imprisoned until the fine was paid, consistent-

ly with the practice adopted in all the courts. But I never dreamt of uniting the two punishments of fine and imprisonment, and I never thought of inflicting a fine till the person at the bar had refused to disclose who was the party concerned in the publication in question. I certainly thought that his refusal, and his putting himself upon his confidential situation, in justification of that refusal, had aggravated the case, and on that account I proposed a fine. The noble and learned lord on the wool-sack, although he did not directly dispute the authority of the House to inflict fine and imprisonment, appeared disposed to throw some doubt upon it. For my own part, I should tremble to hazard an opinion contrary to that of the noble and learned lord upon this or any other subject, were I not fortified by some decided authority. Such an authority does exist in the present instance; I allude to the case of "the King and Flower;" the defendant having been committed by the House, applied to the Court of King's Bench by Habeas Corpus, and no case was ever argued with greater ability than this by the defendant's counsel; yet the court, without hearing any answer, at once confirmed the authority of Parliament. This decision sets at rest the question of right, and I thought it due to the House to quote it, as the privilege seems to have been questioned by my noble and learned friend. But although I stand up for the power of the House, and insist upon its authority to fine and imprison, I would disclaim any intention of acting up to the extent of the power, or any thing like it; on the contrary, I shall be quite content with whatever may be done



on this occasion which, in the opinion of those more conversant, than so young a member of the House can possibly be with the practice and privilege of Parliament, shall appear fit."

There being a general call for lord Tenterden, his lordship expressed a clear opinion in favour of the power claimed. "I think myself bound to inform your lordships" he said, "that it is the constant practice of all courts of law, in inflicting a fine, to add, that the party shall be imprisoned until he pay the fine. I speak of the superior courts in Westminster-hall; and I am sure that instances of this practice will be found in all of those courts. Now I cannot bring myself to think, that while the courts of Westminster-hall possess this privilege, it can properly be denied to your lordships. In what cases, under what circumstances, and to what extent, your lordships should exercise that privilege is quite another question, and one upon which I do not propose to say one word; but I must declare that I think the right of your lordships to the exercise of that privilege is clear, distinct, and indisputable. And why was this power conferred? It was conferred, my lords, not for the protection of those who possess it,—not for the sake of the House of Lords,—not for the sake of the House of Commons,—not for the sake of the courts of law, all of whom are in equal possession of the power,—but for the sake of the nation at large, for whose welfare and well-government it was absolutely necessary that all men should be taught to pay due reverence to the great legislative council of the kingdom, and to those tribunals of justice in which the laws of the land are

administered. These are the reasons why the two Houses of Parliament, and why courts of law, possess this power; these are the reasons why each of them ought to possess it: and I am quite sure that if they, and especially the two Houses of Parliament, did not possess this power of vindicating themselves, it would be impossible that their respective duties could be performed with dignity to themselves, or with advantage to the country."

The Lord Chancellor immediately rose, and attacked the Chief Justice for having given this power to the House of Commons as well as to the peers. "My lords, I am once more compelled to embark in this unfortunate discussion. I say compelled, because, after what has fallen from my noble friend the lord chief justice upon the subject of Parliamentary law, I feel myself under the necessity, the absolute necessity, for the sake of the dignity and the character of Parliament,—for the sake of the country and of the subjects of the king, as well as out of kindness to my noble friend,—first of all to set my noble friend right upon a point of so much importance, and, next, to give my noble friend an opportunity of reconsidering what he has said, and then of explaining himself to your lordships. I have said my lords,—and I repeat it now once more,—that I do very much doubt the existence of this power with which your lordships are said to be invested, and to which some of your lordships appear to cling with so much and such fond tenacity; and, my lords, if I do entertain this doubt, I have at least the consolation of knowing that I am countenanced in my scepticism by some of the very



highest constitutional authorities, and by some of the greatest lawyers that ever the bar produced, or that ever adorned the senate, or that ever added weight and dignity to the bench. But, my lords, in spite of the support which I receive from such great and learned men, I believe that I am quite wrong, and I believe so, my lords, because you tell me so. The Lord Chief Justice may be very right—and I know your lordships think he is—in saying that you have this power; but he cannot be right in the reasons which he has given for the possession of that power. What were those reasons? I heard them, my lords, with wonder and amazement. He tells you, that because the courts of law in Westminster-hall have the power to fine and imprison, so also must the Houses of Lords and Commons have that power. Good God! My Lords, who ever heard till this moment—when were you ever told till this day, when you have been told it by a lord chief justice of England—that the House of Commons has the right to inflict fines and imprisonment upon his majesty's subjects in vindication of their privileges? No one who knows any thing about the law and the constitution of the country can hesitate for a moment in saying that the lord chief justice is grievously in error here; and until I am told by my noble friend, in terms the most clear and the most explicit, I will not believe that he is prepared to defend and justify in law what he has thus said; for he has thereby conferred upon the House of Commons a power, which none of his least learned, none of his worst, none of his most corrupt, none of his least calm, his least temperate, or his least respectable

predecessors, ever dreamed of arming the Commons with. It is quite clear that my noble friend supposes that the Speaker of the House of Commons may summon a man to the bar of the House, fine him 100*l.*, and imprison him till the fine be paid. This must have been his opinion, which I hereby give him an opportunity of retracting, as I have no doubt he will; for, upon reflection, he must see that that opinion is utterly untenable, although his whole argument was intended to support and demonstrate it,—that argument being, that as the courts in Westminster-hall had the power, so also must the Houses of Lords and Commons have it. If the lord chief justice adheres to this opinion, let him make a motion upon the subject, and bring his store of legal research to bear upon it, and support it if he can. Let him do this, and if, in doing this, he should succeed in persuading your lordships that the House of Commons has this power and privilege, your lordships will have the satisfaction of knowing that you have, by the sanction of your lordships' high authority, invested the House of Commons with a power which the stoutest friend of parliamentary privileges never before ventured to arrogate to the Commons' House of Parliament."

Lord Tenterden said, he had never been a member of the House of Commons, and therefore must be far inferior in the means of information on this subject to his noble and learned friend on the woolsack, who was for so long a time one of the most distinguished ornaments of that House. He had spoken from recollection,—it might be from imperfect recollection; but he was strongly impress-



ed with the notion that there were instances in which the House of Commons had exercised this power.\*

“ I was mistaken, I dare say : but with regard to this House, I think there can be no doubt that it has the power.”

The Lord Chancellor. — “ I am very glad, that I have given my noble and learned friend an opportunity of making this explanation, because these things, though very familiar to members of the House of Commons, may not be so well known here, where still there can be no inconvenience in having them understood. The fact is, that the House of Commons has the power of commitment, but not for any certain time ; they have the power to commit as a means of removing an obstruction ; but the confinement of the person so committed can last no longer than the end of the session. The House of Lords, on the other hand, being a court of justice,—a court of record,—nay, the highest court of justice is said to have the power of committing for a time certain, and of fining ; but that power has been disputed by many sound lawyers. I know very well that the Court of King’s Bench has decided otherwise.”

The petition of Mr. Lawson was ordered to be taken into consideration next day, when Lord King moved, that he should be called to the bar, reprimanded by the Lord Chancellor, and discharged on payment of his fees. No peer moved for any severer punishment, but lord Wynford and lord Eldon re-asserted the power of the House to fine and commit till

payment, as a power on which no judge in Westminster-hall could entertain a doubt. It was a settled point. The earl of Mansfield, from the part which the lord chancellor had taken, first in attempting to crush the matter at the outset and then in questioning the power of the House, was induced to ask, whether it was likely that his lordship would administer the reprimand with that severity befitting the nature of the case and their lordships’ dignity ? Would it not be right for the House to move an instruction to his lordship that he would not, in the reprimand, take occasion to hint any doubt of the authority of the House, and that he would impress upon the offender the full magnitude of his offence against their lordships’ privileges. Lord Eldon disapproved of this. He would give the lord chancellor credit for administering the reprimand with due solemnity ; and if he failed, the House had the means of animadversion in its power. The Chancellor himself exclaimed, “ Is it not monstrous to suppose that I shall be so wanting in a sense of the respect due to the dignified office which I hold, so wanting in respect to the House, so wanting in self-respect, as to pervert the occasion of administering the reprimand ordered by the House into a paltry medium of spitting my spite against their privileges ? Whatever doubt I may individually entertain as to one branch of those privileges, is it likely that when called upon, as the official organ of your lordships, to declare your will, I should be at once so base and so foolish as to disgrace my important functions by abandoning the plain line of my duty. The imputation is unworthy of the

\* And there are such cases.—See Hales on Parliaments, 176, 177 : also the case of Arthur Hall, on 4th of February, in the 23rd of Elizabeth.



noble earl—it is unworthy of me—and I fling it back with disdain.”

Mr. Lawson having appeared at the bar, the Lord Chancellor addressed him as follows: “The paragraph of which you have acknowledged yourself to be the printer and publisher, has been pronounced by the unanimous voice of this House to be a gross and scandalous libel upon Edmund Henry Earl of Limerick, a member of this House, and it has also been pronounced to be a high breach of the privileges of this House. Those privileges of this House are conferred upon it by the constitution of the country, and they have been recognized most amply in all times by the law of the land. Those privileges are possessed by this House not for the benefit of any individual member of the House, nor to confer power or aggrandizement upon the members of the House collectively, but they are possessed for the protection and for the defence of this assembly, and for the better execution of those high functions which, for the benefit of the state, the constitution has conferred upon it. It would be a strange thing, indeed, if these privileges which are enjoyed, not only by the other, the inferior branch of the legislature, but also by every court of record in the realm, should have been denied either by the policy or the justice of the law to this illustrious assembly, which combines in itself the character of being the hereditary counsellors of the Crown, of being the superior branch of the legislature, and of being the highest court of judicature in the kingdom. These functions, that of hereditary advisers of the Crown, that of enacting laws, and that of deciding as judges, in the last resort, and without appeal

to any human authority, on all cases as well criminal as civil,—these high functions, these great powers, and this solemn and important duty, are enjoyed by this assembly for the sake of the whole people of England; and in order that they may be exercised with advantage, and in such a manner that the country may enjoy the benefits which result therefrom, it is absolutely necessary that the undoubted privileges of such an assembly should be unquestioned and inviolate. It is therefore, the duty of this House, to deal with you, a self-acknowledged culprit, in such a manner as the grave offence which you have committed merits, in order that you may be deterred from the repetition of it, and in order also—which is the sound end of all punishment—that others may be deterred from the commission of a similar offence. But the House mingles mercy with justice and is anxious to take into consideration the mitigating circumstances which are connected with the situation in which you are placed. You have freely, and at once acknowledged that you are guilty of the offence; you have acknowledged that you are guilty, in fact, by admitting that you are the publisher of the libel; and you have acknowledged that you are guilty in law and in substance, because you have expressed your contrition for that publication. You have also most amply, by petition, and in your own person at that bar, made submission to the House, and to the noble earl who was the object of the slander. Moreover you have suffered, not a long but a close confinement, by the authority of this House, and in the custody of the officers of this House. For these reasons, and



because the House is anxious to temper justice with mercy, their lordships have thought proper to impose on me the painful duty—which I have now performed—of reprimanding you; and having thus reprimanded you, I have to

tell you that you will be forthwith discharged out of custody, upon payment of your fees." On the motion of Lord Farnham, the reprimand was ordered to be entered on the journals.



## CHAP. V.

*The Budget—Proposed changes in Taxes—Opposition to a proposed Tax on transfers in the Funds—Ministers abandon it—Proposed diminution of Duties on Baltic Timber, and Augmentation of those on Canada Timber—Ministers defeated on a Division—Arrangement of the Civil List—Ministers refuse to abide by a Reduction recommended by the Select Committee—Increase of the Army.*

THE other business of the session, which was thus suddenly terminated, related principally to financial matters; retrenchment of expenditure having been one of the pledges and promises under which the new ministers had come into office. On the 11th of February, lord Althorp opened the budget. He estimated the charge for the year at 46,850,000*l.* The revenue for 1830 had been 50,060,000, but, making allowance for the taxes which had been already repealed, it could not be assumed as likely to yield more, during the present year, than 47,150,000*l.* The revenue, therefore, would exceed the charges of the year only by about 300,000*l.*, a very scanty allowance; and not affording much room for reduction of taxes, although he was well aware that the popular expectations awaited, and the necessities of the country required, large reductions.

Still, however, his lordship was of opinion that something might be done, not indeed by directly repealing those taxes which were supposed to press particularly on the lower classes, for these classes consumed few taxable commodities—but indirectly, by reducing the

taxes which pressed on the industry of the country; by relieving trade from fiscal embarrassments, and thus adding to the means of employing industry; by improving the general system of our revenue, without detriment to its real productiveness, and yet with great benefit to the country—here repealing, here reducing, and there introducing a more equal distribution;—and he avowed that he had taken his principles and general views from sir Henry Parnell's work entitled, "Financial Reform." Taxes he divided into three classes. First, taxes on commodities of which there would be an increased consumption, and, by that means, an increased revenue in consequence of the reduction. Secondly, taxes which, instead of being equally and impartially distributed amongst all classes, pressed more severely on one part of the community. The third class consisted of those taxes which, besides interfering with commerce, took more out of the pockets of the people than was furnished to the revenue. The reductions, which he proposed under each head were as follows.

Under the first head he intended to reduce the duty on tobacco.



The duty at present levied was 3*s.* per pound on the tobacco as imported, and 9*s.* on the manufactured article (snuff and cigars). He proposed to reduce the first to 1*s.* 6*d.*, and the last to 4*s.* 6*d.* The amount of revenue derived from that tax was at present 2,800,000*l.* The loss to the revenue, however, would not be so much as the half, or 1,400,000*l.*; for he calculated on such an increased consumption as would reduce that loss to 800,000*l.* Thus, while the relief extended to the consumers of the article would be 1,400,000*l.*, the exchequer would only suffer a diminution of income to the extent of 800,000*l.*; and, which was a matter of paramount importance, the Irish smuggling trade in tobacco would be destroyed. Another duty to be reduced was one, which he admitted did not seem, at first sight, to bear so immediately on the comforts of the people, but which nevertheless was felt as a burthen—the duty on newspapers, stamps, and advertisements. At present the duty on each stamp was 4*d.*, with a discount of 20 per cent. He proposed to make it 2*d.*, without any discount. All advertisements at present paid a duty of 3*s.* 6*d.*: he proposed to reduce it to 1*s.* for each advertisement of less than ten lines; and 2*s.* 6*d.* for all above. The saving to the public would be 190,000*l.*, and the loss to the revenue he calculated at 100,000*l.*; the difference being made up, according to his lordship's calculation, by an increase in the circulation of papers, and in the number of advertisements which the diminished rate was expected to produce.

Under the second head of taxes, those which bore with unequal pressure on particular parts of the

community, he intended to touch only one, but he intended to repeal it entirely. It was the duty on sea-borne coal, amounting to 830,000*l.* No tax pressed more immediately on the lower and less wealthy orders; its repeal would not only diminish the expense of what was a necessary of life, but, by diminishing the cost of manufactures, in which fuel was of essential importance, it would remove an impediment to industry, and increase the demand for labour.

The last class of taxes contained those which interfered with the interests of commerce, and took more money from the pockets of the people than the revenue was benefitted. The tax on tallow and candles came under this head, and therefore was one of those which he proposed for reduction. Many benefits to the less wealthy classes of society would, he expected, accrue from this reduction. If the farmer, for example, made use of the raw material which came into his possession in his domestic arrangements, and made his own candles, without the excise duty and the manufacturer's profits, it was evident he would be a considerable gainer. And so with respect to other persons engaged in industry, from whom a greater amount of duty was taken under the present arrangement than was counterbalanced by the benefit derived by the exchequer. The amount was 420,000*l.* a year; but in the present year, the revenue would not suffer to that extent, as he had yielded to the advice of the manufacturers, not to let the abolition take effect for half a year, in order that their stock might be consumed. Another tax of this kind was that on printed calicoes. It not only operated as an impedi-



ment to our manufactures, but was partial in its pressure and most expensive in its collection; thus uniting the greatest objections that could be offered to the imposition of any tax. Its amount was actually 2,000,000*l.* per annum, while but 500,000*l.* went into the exchequer; and it fell almost exclusively on the poor class of consumers. He would abolish it entirely. Under the same head came the duty on glass, yielding 600,000*l.*, which he proposed to repeal. It discouraged industry,—it prevented the extension of an important manufacture, for the increase of which this country offered every facility. He had no doubt that when the tax was abolished, our possession of the raw material, our command of fuel, and the cheapness of labour in this country, would render glass an article of export.—Lastly, under this head came several smaller miscellaneous duties, which were to be repealed or reduced. Of these the chief was the auction duty on the sale of land, which he meant to repeal altogether, as the revenue derived very little from it, while it operated very inconveniently in sales of landed property.—These were the taxes which he intended to deal with in the way, and for the reason he had mentioned. The result stood thus—

## Taxes Reduced. Estimated Loss.

Tobacco.	
1,400,000	800,000
Newspapers.	
190,000	100,000
Coals and Slate.	
830,000	830,000
Candles from October.	
420,000	200,000

Cottons.	
500,000	500,000
Glass.	
600,000	600,000
Auctions.	
60,000	60,000
Miscellaneous.	
80,000	80,000
<hr/>	<hr/>
£4,080,000	£3,170,000

But this was a reduction which the revenue could not bear; and the next point was, how to make good this loss, without imposing an equal burthen on the people. In the first place, he intended to alter and equalize the duties on foreign wines. French wines at present paid 7*s.* 3*d.* a gallon, other foreign wines 4*s.* 10*d.*, and Cape wine, 2*s.* 3*d.* He proposed to equalize them at one standing duty of 5*s.* 6*d.* per gallon. So far from the consumption being diminished by this change, there was every reason to believe it would be increased. The present rate of consumption would yield, at the equalized duty, about 1,830,000*l.*, while the present receipt was, in round numbers, only 1,590,000*l.* From this source therefore he expected an increase of 240,000*l.* The next tax which he intended to modify was that on timber. The duty on foreign European timber in the rough whole state was 5*s.* per load; that on Canada timber 10*s.*; while the duty on the same timber, cut up in deals, for example, was, on the European 45*s.*, per load; and that on the Canada but 5*s.* 9*d.* The tax, evidently, as it stood, was one on the manufactured article in the one case in favour of the Canada, upon which, nevertheless, a higher raw duty was levied. He proposed not to actually equalize the duties,



but to place them nearer such a level as would conduce to the general interests of the country, without injury to any particular class or individuals, while the revenue derived from the tax would be considerably increased. Timber was an article not easily smuggled, so that an equalizing duty was not so necessary as it would be with a less bulky commodity. He proposed, therefore, to raise the duty on European timber to 50s. per load, and that on the Canada timber to 10s.; rates which would bring them nearer to an equality in the market than those unacquainted with the timber trade could readily imagine, while the preference which we bestowed on the produce of our own colony would be maintained. He was warranted from existing data to calculate the increase of revenue from this change of duty at 760,000*l.*; but to prevent disappointment and needless controversy, he would take it but at 600,000*l.* The repealed duty on printed calicoes, he proposed to replace by a duty on cotton. He had repealed the former, because it fell more particularly on the less wealthy classes. Now he proposed to throw the tax over all the consumers of cotton, instead of on one part, as the duty at present pressed, and thus save the revenue, and relieve the poor consumer of the article. This would be accomplished by a duty of 1*d.* per pound on all raw cottons imported, with a drawback duty to the same amount on all manufactured cotton exported. He admitted there were objections to this drawback duty, and that the tax was one on the raw material of industry, but it was small, and these objections were counterbalanced by

its advantages. He estimated that it would produce 500,000*l.* He further reckoned on an increase of 100,000*l.*, by altering the duties on the export of coal. They amounted at present to a prohibition, being 17*s.* 6*d.* on large coal, and 4*s.* 6*d.* on the smaller. He would make the duty 10*s.* on both.

The balance of the loss occasioned by reduction was to be made up, not by modifying existing taxes, but by imposing new ones. First, a tax on passengers by steam-boats, varying in its rate according to the distance travelled, and which might be taken, in the meantime, at 100,000*l.* The other new tax was more important. A duty of one-half per cent was to be imposed on the *bona fide* sale or transfer of landed property, but not to extend to such transfers as were made merely for the purpose of security. This being a tax of one-half per cent laid on the landed interest alone, it was contrary to justice, as well as to every sound principle of finance, that any species of property should be taxed more than another, and he therefore proposed a duty of one-half per cent on every *bona fide* transfer of funded property, with a similar exemption in the case of mere transfers in security. It might, perhaps, be objected that funded property was expressly protected from taxes of this kind by acts of parliament. He admitted that the words of the acts creating this species of property admitted of that interpretation, that funded property should be exempt from all "other (than those expressed) charges and impositions whatever;" but Mr. Pitt himself contended, since that act was passed, that it



could not be construed into a breach of the public faith, that the holder of funded property should be compelled to contribute his just share towards the exigencies of the country. Why should it be exempt from burdens, to which land, and every other species of property were subjected? He admitted, that his proposed tax on the transfer of funded property would be but a beginning, but then it was a beginning that could not be cited as a mischievous precedent; for all it went to accomplish was, to place it and landed property on a fair and equal footing with respect to the public burdens. From these taxes on transfers of landed and funded property, he expected 1,200,000*l.*; from the former, 400,000*l.*, and from the latter, 800,000*l.* The result of the modified and new taxes would stand thus:—

			£.
Wine	...	...	240,000
Timber	...	...	600,000
Cotton	...	...	500,000
Coals	...	...	100,000
Steam	...	...	100,000
Transfers	...	...	1,200,000
			<hr/>
			2,740,000

On the other hand, the amount of the taxes repealed, or reduced, was 4,080,000*l.*, so that the tax payers gained 1,340,000*l.*, while the public service would not suffer. The whole revenue for the year would stand as follows:—

		£.
Income of 1830	...	50,060,000
Deduct loss by taxes		
taken off, 1830	...	2,910,000
		<hr/>
Income left for 1831		47,150,000

VOL. LXXIII.

Arrears of Excise more		
in January, 1831,		
than in 1830	...	580,000
		<hr/>
		47,730,000
Deduct taxes taken off		
as estimated	...	3,170,000
		<hr/>
		44,560,000
Add taxes to be laid on		2,740,000
		<hr/>
		47,300,000
Deduct estimated ex-		
penditure for 1831		46,850,000
		<hr/>

Surplus for 1831 450,000

The financial project thus opened by Lord Althorp, was vehemently attacked from all sides. It was the most hazardous of all experiments, it was urged, to commence a financial year with arrangements which furnished merely a possibility that, at its close, there might be a surplus of 450,000*l.*; even that trifling surplus being brought out, not by taking known sums from known amounts, but by proceeding speculatively on the supposed result of new taxes, and new arrangements of old ones. The probability was, that, instead of a surplus, it would be found necessary to raise, by Exchequer bills, a sum to meet the charges of the year, gratifying the country, for a time, by an apparent relief from taxation, only to produce the necessity of afterwards imposing taxes heavier than those which had been taken off. This dangerous expedient, too, was the less justifiable, as not one shilling was included in the budget as being applicable to the diminution of the debt. Ministers might easily reduce taxes when they refused to provide for paying off any portion of the debt; but that was neither

[K]



retrenchment nor prudence. There still stood on the journals of the House the unrescinded resolution of 1819, "that to provide for the exigencies of the public service, to make such progressive reduction of the national debt as may adequately support public credit, and to afford to the country a prospect of future relief from a part of its present burdens, it is absolutely necessary that there should be a clear surplus of the income of the country, beyond the expenditure, of not less than 5,000,000*l*." The finance committee had thought 3,000,000*l*. sufficient for a sinking fund, instead of 5,000,000*l*.; and even in 1830, the former amount had been realized as a surplus, within a very small sum. It was by means of this surplus income that ministers were able to operate in reduction of the debt when the rate of interest was low—had reduced the interest of it this year by half a million, and a year or two ago by a million and a half. Why was this course to be interrupted? Was this the performance of the ministerial promises to reduce expenditure—the expedient which they had discovered not to take money from the people? No doubt, if the sums applicable to the reduction of the debt were no longer to be raised, they would remain in the pockets of the tax-payers; but to call this a reduction of expenditure was to cheat with words the popular expectations which ministers knew, though they had raised them, they could not meet with realities. To provide no contribution towards the diminution of the debt was not retrenchment, in any honest meaning of the word, and was conducive, neither to the honour, the credit, nor the security of the country.

It was almost admitted, that the budget was not one of reduction; it was one of mere transposition. Taxes were reduced or repealed, and, to make up the loss, new ones were imposed, the sole merit claimed for the budget being, that the taxes modified and imposed were of a better kind than those which were repealed. But it was denied that the changes were, in any important point, justifiable or tolerable. The taxes repealed were, with few exceptions, the lightest, and, according to all sound principle, the most unexceptionable that could be imagined. They were not direct and compulsory, but optional on consumable articles, and were to be removed, while taxes were allowed to remain which bore on the lower orders, not only severely, but directly and unavoidably. The whole kingdom must be in amazement at seeing ministers set out by selecting as a tax, to be reduced, the duty on tobacco—a mere superfluity, the reduction on which, moreover, would be too trifling to affect any man's comfort. Who had ever called for a reduction like that? The relief given in the article of newspaper-stamps and advertisements, would scarcely be felt, and would aid nobody but newspaper proprietors—if it did even that to any degree that could be estimated. Was it, that something must appear to be done to flatter the press? And what was to be said of a ministry pretending to aid newspaper learning and philosophy, from their love of knowledge, and yet imposing a tax on the most ready and useful of all means of communication? How was the poll-tax on steam-boat passengers to be regulated and collected? Why tax intercourse which was not optional, but, in



a thousand instances, necessary? Why tax a man because nature had unfortunately placed an arm of the sea, or the Irish channel between his residence and the spot to which business, necessity, or even pleasure called him? Why fetter the internal communications of the country for the paltry sum of 100,000*l.*? It would have been desirable, too, to have had it stated at what expense this sum was to be raised, for the very nature of the tax, reaching each individual passenger, and varying with the distance he intended to go, seemed to threaten a costly mode of collection. Above all, what rational man could ever have taken up the idea of reducing the duty on the luxury of tobacco, and supplying its place by a tax on the necessary act of travelling? Still less would the lower orders, whose comfort was declared to be the great object of the budget, be gainers by the equalization of the wine duties. French wines, which they never used, were to be made cheaper; the men who indulged in Burgundy and Claret were to be benefitted; but Port, which was in universal use as a medicine, wherever the poor man could reach it, was to be made dearer; and Cape wine, the product of our own colonies, was to be laid under a duty which would amount to a prohibition. The alteration of the timber duties, would not only injure the colonies, but be detrimental to the shipping interest, already so low, without any corresponding benefit; and whatever was gained in houses by the removal of the duty on glass, would be found to be counterbalanced by the increased price of wood.

In all these respects, it was said, the budget was merely a pretext

of doing something, while, in truth, it did nothing, or did mischief. But all these matters were passed over slightly in comparison with the proposed tax on the transfers of funded property, to which the chancellor of the Exchequer trusted for 800,000*l.*, nearly one-third of his substituted taxation. Members in opposition, and members enlisted among the friends of ministers, joined equally in denouncing it as a proposition which betrayed utter practical ignorance—impracticable if it were just, and a foul breach of the national faith, if it were practicable. The holder of stock was the public creditor. He had acquired his property under an express condition, that no measure like this should affect him; but ministers seemed never to have even read the solemn contract which they deliberately proposed to violate. The acts of parliament laid down certain forms to be observed in assigning or transferring stock, and declared that no other form should be valid, and added, “that no stamp duties should be charged on any transfer or assignment of stock.” The same provisions were in all the acts. This was the express stipulation with the country, on the faith of which the public creditors had advanced their money for the use of the state, in times of great difficulty and peril. What words could be more explicit? How were they to be evaded—what honest man could wish to evade them? The House might adopt the ministerial proposition, but it could do so only by violating the public faith, and descending from that proud distinction which Britain had hitherto maintained over every other country of the world. “If,” said sir Robert Peel, “in times when, ac-



according to the admission of the government, the productive industry of the country is in a state of steady and progressive improvement—if in a time of peace, and with no pressure upon the productive industry of the country—if at such a time, and under such circumstances, in direct violation and contempt of numerous acts of parliament, you shall impose a duty upon the transfer of funded property, what security will the public creditor have if times shall return like those of 1797 or 1798—times when, unappalled by the dangers which surrounded us, we fearlessly adhered to the maintenance of the public faith, and by doing so were enabled to surmount all the difficulties by which we were encompassed, I say, sir, if such times shall again return, what security will the public creditor have, if in the present circumstances of the country we impose a duty in violation of the condition of the act of parliament, upon the transfer of his property—what security will he have that we shall not, under the pressure of a foreign war, and of more adverse circumstances, resort to him, and quote this violation of the public faith as a justification for our violating it again? This is not a question of policy or prudence: it is a question of morality. If the state is not prepared to keep its engagements with the public creditor, shut up your courts of justice at once, and do not call upon individuals to fulfil theirs.”

But, even if the House could ever so far forget what was due to honesty and the character of the country as to entertain the proposition, the impolicy of the measure ought to condemn it. Were ministers aware of the causes which, in addition to the dependence on

the national faith which was now to be cut down, gave our funds their superiority over the funds of other countries? They were the rapidity with which transfers could be made, and the facility with which the fundholder could bring his property into the market, and dispose of it, without loss, that made our funds a source of continually increasing wealth and prosperity to the country. Did ministers suppose, in their ignorance, that the intended tax would not interfere with the arrangements of the stock-market? and, if it did, would it not interfere with the facilities of transfer which were so essential to the ordinary transactions of commerce? The consequence of the measure would be, to send an immense quantity of capital out of this country into the stocks of foreign governments. Mr. J. Smith, himself a banker, and a declared friend of the ministry, whose formation, and pledges for reform he stated himself to have witnessed with entire satisfaction, said, it must be recollected that the funds presented a very convenient mode of investing money, so as to render it convertible for the purposes of credit; but, if they were to lay on so heavy a tax, that a gentleman could not make a transfer of 100,000*l.* consols without paying 500*l.* for it, he would venture to say that no such transfer would be made. He need hardly remind the House of what large advances bankers were in the habit of making upon stock. This practice, however, would cease with the commencement of such a tax as that now proposed. It was to be laid, indeed, upon *bonâ fide* transfers only: but God knew how the chancellor of the Exchequer would be able to



distinguish between what were, and what were not, *bond fide* transfers. He must say, as a banker, that if he could not sell stock without paying such a tax as this, he should think a long while before he lent any money at all; and he was quite sure that those with whom he was connected would think quite as long. At a time when there were contracts in London for a million stand of arms, and for a million yards of cloth, what prudent man would have undertaken them if he were deprived of that species of accommodation which the present untaxed nature of the funds afforded them. "I had heard of this proposition," continued Mr. Smith, "before it was made to the House, and I communicated it to a friend of mine—the member for Callington (Mr. Baring). His answer to me was, 'Nonsense, it can't be true; you are imposed upon by some stock-jobbing lie.' I replied, 'I am not imposed upon, and it is not a stock-jobbing lie: I am well informed, depend upon it, for I received my information from a gentleman who never deceived me yet, and who has, perhaps, some means of his own of obtaining information respecting the financial operations of government.'" He was very sorry to oppose any measure of the present government, but this measure he would oppose in every stage; because it was injurious to the best interests of the country. It should never be forgotten, that any embarrassment of the monied interest would lead to general embarrassment; that if the funds were to fall, so would all other species of property; and that, what was worse than all, an inglorious stigma would be cast upon the hitherto unsullied honour of England. He

would earnestly recommend ministers to consult with those who understood this subject, and who had no interest in it.

Mr. Charles Grant, and Sir J. Wrottesley defended the proposition from the charges brought against it, their argument being, that it was no more a violation of public faith than the including the incomes of fund-holders under the property tax, and was a counterpart to the tax on the transfer of land which was to accompany it. They referred to the authority of Mr. Pitt to shew that the principle of taxing the fundholder was no breach of contract with him. Mr. Pitt had said, "When a general assessment upon income is to take place, no distinction ought to be made as to the sources from which that income may arise. There can be no fair objection taken by the stockholder upon the occasion; there can be no question of a breach of good faith, of national stipulation with the public creditor by thus imposing upon him what every other subject of the realm is to incur. The public creditor enjoys his security under the most sacred obligations of the state, and whenever an idea has been started in debate, of imposing upon the stockholders, separately and distinctly, any sort of tax, I have been prepared to reprobate the attempt as utterly inconsistent with good faith and public engagements. The public creditors are to be secured against any imposts distinctly levelled at them as annuitants of the public." Nevertheless, Mr. Pitt argued, that, as members of the community, stockholders were liable to be taxed upon their incomes derived from the public funds, when a tax was to be levied upon the income



of every description of persons in the realm; and, when it was no longer in the power of the fundholders to say they could avoid this tax by removing their property from the funds to landed security, &c., every argument against including them in the assessment was withdrawn. In like manner, the government now said, the stockholder should not be able to say, "I will escape the tax, by investing my funds in some other species of property," because he would find other descriptions of property alike subject to taxation. That was in accordance with the view taken by Mr. Pitt of the income tax, a view in which the parliament of the day coincided. Had the question been a new one, there might have been something in the arguments now urged; but, after the exemption from taxation had once been broken in upon, by the property tax, no other tax of a similar kind could be considered a violation of the acts of parliament. It should be recollected, too, that the proposed tax was accompanied, in the present instance, by a tax on the transfer of all landed property.

To all this it was answered, in the first place, that no precedent, even if one had existed, could possibly justify injustice. But farther, there was no trace of similarity between the two cases, and still less could there be any thing fair in taxing the transfer of the funds, because the transfer of land was to be taxed at the same time, and at the same rate. The income tax fell upon the incomes of all the subjects in the empire. The incomes derived from professions and from offices, and the incomes derived from land, were equally subject to it as the incomes de-

rived from the funds. But the difference here is, that the present tax is proposed to be laid upon the transfer of funds. Land, it is well known, could not be transferred easily; and the policy of our laws had thrown many difficulties in the way of it. There were many large estates, no transfer of which had taken place during a very long period. The result would be, that prosperous estates would not be subject to the tax. Land was generally sold, either on the demise of the head of a family, to pay the fortunes of the younger children; or, as unfortunately had been more generally the case of late years, land was sold under adverse circumstances, to pay off debts and incumbrances, and it was no recommendation of a tax that it operated principally in circumstances like these. Transfers of funds must be incomparably greater and more frequent than those of land, and therefore a duty of half per cent upon such operations bore no proportion as a per centage on the value of the property to the same rate of duty when imposed on transfers of landed property; and the parties, who would bear the chief burden of this tax, were not those who possessed a superabundance, but a moderate amount of property, transfers of stock being made much oftener by them, than by the more wealthy. To bring the tax even ostensibly within the principle of the property tax, the proposition ought to have been, to impose a tax on transfers of property of all kinds. Even then, it would be found impossible to get over the distinct words of the acts of parliament, protecting specially transfers of property of this kind, which declared expressly, that on such transfers no duties should be charged.



“While these words exist,” said sir Edward Sugden, “it is impossible to pass a bill imposing this duty, without reciting and repealing those clauses in the acts under which the money was borrowed—and this he believed no minister would venture to do.”

The expression of public feeling, and the result of farther inquiries, induced ministers to abandon the measure, which it was very plain they could not press without being defeated. On the 14th, the chancellor of the Exchequer told the House that, of course, it had not been in his power, consistently with the dignity of his office, and the interests of the country, previously to institute any very minute or extensive inquiry into the probable effects of his proposed measures; such an inquiry, in fact, might not only defeat its own object, but prove detrimental to the public service. He had, however, inquired, so far as was then possible for him, more particularly with respect to his proposed duty of half per cent on the transfer of stocks—first, as to the practicability of such a tax, and next, as to the practicability of at all times ascertaining whether the transfer of funded property was a *bonâ fide*, or merely made for the sake of security. His inquiries had been made of the governor of the Bank of England, who had given him his opinion that such a tax was practicable, and that the distinction between a *bonâ fide* transfer of stock, and others of a different kind was easily ascertainable. But, although he had this authority, and although he could not at all admit the weight of the objections brought against his proposed duty, as to its being a breach of public faith (if it was, he would

not be the man to propose it), he thought, after what had taken place, and after the result of more extensive inquiry, it would not be just nor expedient to press the imposition of it. He therefore took advantage of that first occasion of relieving the public mind from all further suspense on the subject, by declaring that ministers did not intend to propose a transfer duty on stock. They necessarily gave up, too, the corresponding intended tax on the transfer of land; for, having abandoned it as to one species of property, it would not be just to impose it on the other which was already so heavily taxed. As this concession, however, struck off 1,200,000*l.* of the revenue which ministers had intended to substitute for the reduced and repealed taxes, it would now be necessary to retain part of the latter; and government had determined not to carry into effect the proposed reductions in the duties on tobacco and glass, which replaced 1,400,000*l.*

Another item in the budget, from which the chancellor of the Exchequer had assumed an additional revenue of 600,000*l.*, was the proposed alteration in the timber duties, in regard to which ministers were not so prudent or so fortunate. From the moment it was proposed, ministers had been warned that it would be strenuously resisted, as unjust to Canada, and most injurious to the shipping interests. After much deliberation and many inquiries, they resolved to alter their plan so far, as not to propose any change during the present year, and to make the alteration, when it did come, gradual. On the 18th of March, in a committee on the Customs acts, the chancellor of the Exchequer stated,



that he had as yet seen no reason to depart from the change of which he had formerly given notice, but he felt disposed, on considerations of general convenience, to make it more gradual in its operation than he had at first intended. That Canada timber, though cheaper, was much inferior to that brought from the Baltic, no man would deny. Sir A. Seppings had declared that it was not fit to be used in the navy, and it was entirely excluded from all timber contracts. The duty on Canada timber was about one-third, and that on Baltic timber two-thirds, amounting almost to a prohibition. Thus the effect of the system was, to compel the consumer in this country to use an inferior, instead of a better article, on the erroneous idea of benefitting the Canadas at the expense of the mother country. The north of Europe could give us only timber for our manufactures, while the soil of the Canadas could be applied to other beneficial purposes. Why, then, exclude the better article of the countries of the north, when they undoubtedly would take a much larger quantity of our manufactures, if the almost prohibitory duty were removed from the only production which they had to give us in return? Two reasons had been assigned for maintaining the present system. It was said, that the alteration would be injurious to the shipping interests; but he would not admit that government would be justified in sacrificing to that interest all other classes of the community. In a country like this, men must look rather to its general commerce, than to any particular branch, however important it might be individually. The other objection was, that the alteration would injure the Canadas—and

so it would, if the capital now employed there in the timber trade could not be easily and profitably diverted into other channels of employment, and, in that case, he admitted, his proposed plan should not be enforced. But, from the best information he could obtain, no such result could fairly be anticipated. On the contrary, he was convinced that, if the capital employed in the timber trade were diverted to agriculture, the change would be of the most essential benefit to the colony. With Nova Scotia and New Brunswick the case was different; and, if their timber trade was to be annihilated by the change, it became necessary to proceed as gradually as the general benefit of the country would permit. Therefore, and to diminish likewise, even to the shipping interest, any inconvenience which might arise, he had resolved not to press for the immediate increase of the duty on Canada timber, and decrease of that on timber from the Baltic, but to make both gradual, and not to begin till next year. He meant, therefore, to propose, “that, after the 1st of January, 1832, the duty upon Baltic timber should be decreased by 6s.; after the 1st of January, 1833, a like sum of 6s.; and after the 1st of January, 1834, a farther sum of 3s., making a total decrease of 15s., and then the difference between the duty upon Baltic and Canada timber would be 30s. in favour of the latter.” The duty upon Baltic deals was to be reduced within the same years, as those upon timber, from 49s. to 43s., and in 1834 to 40s.; but no alteration was intended to take place upon the deals or planks from Canada. He then moved the following resolution:—“That in place of the duties in customs now



payable upon the import of Baltic timber and deals into this country, the duty upon deals shall be, from and after the 1st of January, 1832, at 49s.; and from and after the 1st of January, 1833, 43s.; and from and after the 1st of January, 1834, at 40s. per load."

Mr. Attwood and Mr. Robinson opposed the principle of the proposed change as an emanation of the theories which had injured the country in many ways, and in this instance added positive injustice to practical mischief. It was not now time to ask whether colonies were entitled to protection; we had adopted the principle of protection, and no act of the legislature ought to be held more sacred than that which gave them protection. Previous to 1810, our supply of foreign timber was principally from the Baltic ports; but in 1809 and 1810 we had recourse to our Canadian colonists. What was the object of the difference in the duties then adopted? Was it in order to obtain cheap timber, or to derive a greater revenue? Neither. The duty was protective, and it was intended to be protecting and prohibitory. The price and quality of Canadian timber were as well known then as now. It was not to enable this country to purchase cheap timber, but in order to guard against the danger which then threatened us from Europe, and which, as it might occur at a future period, it would not be proper to place us entirely at the mercy of the northern powers for the supply of timber, which might be interrupted by the same political danger. This was the language of a committee on the trade in 1821. The case was no less than this—that at a time of peril, when all Europe was leagued

against us, we adopted the measure, and, on the faith of an act of Parliament, our merchants embarked their capital, on a pledge as sacred as Parliament could give, that it should be safe. The danger had passed away, but was the House prepared to sacrifice the men who had saved us from danger? The trade was in a precarious state, and on the faith of the protection offered to them our merchants exerted the enterprise which always belonged to them; they invested their fortunes in the recesses of the Canadian forests, erected mills and machinery, cut canals, and built wharfs and warehouses, all of which would be useless if this protection were withdrawn. The principle on which Ministers defended the measure applied to the whole of our colonial system; and if applied to all our colonies, it would loosen every link by which the empire was bound together. The same principle, which applied to-day to the timber duties, would be applicable to the abolition of all protections to our domestic industry. Even if it were agreed that it would be better to abandon the system of protection, the resolution should be carried into practice in a period of universal prosperity at home and of tranquillity abroad. But was this such a time? What market could we rely upon for three months? It was said, that the capital might seek employment elsewhere; but when it deserted its old channel and opened a new one, some political event might occur to close up the new market, and, after all this ruin, we might be driven back to the old system which we had abandoned. The advantages of the proposed change, even if they could be justly sought after, were merely conjec-



tural, while the injury inflicted was certain and incurable. The promised benefit to the consumer had already vanished, the price of Baltic timber having risen more than the difference of the duty, even from the anticipation of the change. It was said, that if we bought our timber of the Northern Powers, they would be compelled to take our manufactures in exchange. Now they had eleven years' experience to guide them in deciding that question. During that period of the timber trade of Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Prussia, our exports to other countries had decreased,—In the year 1822 the exports to those countries amounted to 1,510,040*l.*, and in 1829 they had decreased to 1,234,678*l.*, while our exports to Canada, the trade of which they were about to destroy, were in 1822, 1,597,261*l.*; in 1829, 2,206,913*l.* Were the mere assertions of theorists to be taken against these facts, and the system of free trade applied thus to one interest after another, until all the elements of the wealth and greatness of the country were destroyed?

Mr. Poulett Thomson, Vice-president of the Board of Trade, entered into a long detail to shew that the duties in favour of Canada had never been considered permanent—that greater alterations than those now proposed had formerly been recommended by a committee of the House of Lords—that the Canada timber trade had been a losing one for the country—that Baltic timber was carried to Canada, and imported thence as Canadian timber—and that if any considerable quantity of shipping ceased to find employment in the Canada trade, it would find it in the coasting trade, and even in the increased timber trade of the Baltic,

for it could be shewn that more timber was imported thence in British than in foreign vessels. But the question was taken up on the complete and sudden change which ministers had made their measure undergo, converting it without notice, upon a mere financial item of the budget, into what was substantially a question of free trade—for it now formed no part of the budget of the year—a question requiring much investigation and yet to be discussed and determined extempore. Mr. Herries stated that he would undertake to say that such an example of political trick had never been attempted to be practised on the House of Commons. What had they come down for that night? Why to consider a measure which had been introduced by the noble lord as a part of his budget. But instead of that measure they had been surprised by the substitution of another in its place. That change must have been induced by causes which operated with a wonderful celerity. He had only the other night put a question respecting the manner in which the timber duties were to be levied in Ireland. The answer of the Chancellor of the Exchequer implied, that up to that time his intentions with regard to the measure remained the same. What, then, was the reason of the sudden change which had taken place, as he believed, within a few hours? Why the Chancellor of the Exchequer had ascertained that, whether he would or no, he could not carry the measure as it had originally been proposed. He knew that the majority was against him; Ministers had, therefore, come down and changed their front as it were in a moment, and met the House with the long statement of



the Vice-president of the Board of Trade, and a perfectly new measure, new in its purpose, in its conditions, and in its terms; and such a measure they called upon the House to sanction at such an hour of the night, and on such a discussion as must take place when members were wholly unprepared to enter upon it; and this, too, upon a subject of the very last importance to the very highest interests of the country. He could scarcely express his astonishment at hearing such a proposition made to the House of Commons. He did not say what his opinion might be on the policy of the measure, or how far it might be adviseable, at a proper time and under proper circumstances, to adopt that policy. That was a question of large importance to the country, and one upon which he believed the House would not decide, until after it should have undergone a full, and deliberate, and long discussion. He did not say he was opposed to the policy of the measure, but he should never have dared to propose it to the House under circumstances like those which attended it that night. No man, no government, had a right to make such a proposition in such a manner, and on such an occasion.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted that he had changed his mind on this subject only lately, but imputed it to a proper attention to depositions of merchants who had waited on him. He would consent to no farther inquiry, not even to the appointment of a select committee, which Mr. Herries had recommended. That being the case, Mr. Attwood moved an amendment, that the chairman do leave the chair, the effect of which would be to prevent the measure being farther proceeded

with, and to reserve it for future examination when and how the House should think fit. Sir Robert Peel insisted on the absolute necessity of careful inquiry on this new question so unexpectedly raised; and a select committee would discharge that duty much more satisfactorily than the whole House. They stood upon the report of a committee of the House in 1821, which went fully into the subject, recommending the existing scale. Ministers were bound to show that that report was unfounded; but not even one cogent argument had been urged to prove such to be the case, and yet they were to be excluded from that farther inquiry which they desired—and this too when the resolution referred only to a future year, and could not require immediate or instant decision. Why was this new measure so long delayed? Why postpone the discussion to the day preceding the question of reform, which must necessarily occupy several nights? Why, too, not begin till nine at night, when, on all other occasions, the important business of the evening—and this would not be the least important question of the session—always began at five? He could not help thinking that this singular delay was intentional? and he could not consent to allow all those important interests involved in this question to remain in a state of suspense, till it accorded with the pleasure of the noble lord to fix some subsequent day for continuing the adjourned debate. Would the Chancellor of the Exchequer either allow this question to have precedence of reform on Monday, or would he agree to the appointment of a select committee? If he would do neither of these



things, he would vote for the amendment.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer refused to agree to either of these proposals. The House divided, and ministers were left in a minority of forty-six, the numbers being, for the amendment 236, and for the original motion 190.

Other items of the budget, likewise, ministers found it prudent to modify or to abandon. The proposed tax on steam-boat passengers, which was denounced from all sides of the House and petitioned against by all parts of the country, was given up. The intended increase of the duty on Cape wines was diminished; the proposed duty of 1*d.* per pound on the importation of raw-cotton was reduced to  $\frac{5}{8}$  of a penny, or 5*s.* 10*d.* per cwt., and the export drawback duty was abandoned. The whole affair had produced a strong impression of the practical inefficiency of the government; and, in any other circumstances, it could not have survived the defeats which it had already experienced. It had avoided one discomfiture in appearance, but had suffered it in reality, by withdrawing the proposed tax on transfers in the funds, the most important item of the budget. It anticipated another on the question of the timber duties—would not seek it by pressing the original question—would not acknowledge its weakness by dropping the measure entirely—and was again defeated. Had there been nothing else, ministers must have gone out. But amidst all their failures and disasters, they remained in possession of one sure pretext to retain their power. The reform bill was the anchor by which they held; the gloom of their defeats

was lost in the glare of popular innovation. They held out large bribes of political power to the people, which would all be withdrawn if they were driven from office. The people lost all concern for other measures, regarding either foreign or domestic policy, in exclusive attention to the more popular constitution which had been promised them, and treated as paltry all deficiencies of the ministers from whom this constitution was expected. Ministers, on the other hand, were bound still more strictly to extend the popularity of the reform bill, which furnished the only chance by which they could remain in power, and to refuse every concession that might diminish the popular demand for change by which alone they were supported. In a question with parliament it was very plain they would be found wanting: the policy imposed by the necessity of their situation was, either to resign, or to place themselves at the head of the popular excitement against the parliament. The reform bill became more than a mere measure of policy; it had become the sole tenure of their own power.

The late ministry had gone out of office after a vote by which the House of Commons declared its opinion that the civil list should be referred to a select committee, avowedly for the purpose of separating the proper expenditure of the crown from that large expenditure of which no part was occasioned by the crown, and bringing the latter, in whole or in part, annually under the power of parliament. The new ministers lost no time, after the meeting of parliament, in bringing forward their ideas as to the manner in which the civil



list ought to be arranged. They were stated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, on the 4th of February, when moving that the new estimates of the civil list should be referred to the committee. He had left out of that estimate, he said, every thing not connected with the personal comforts of his majesty, and the proper dignity of the crown; and these latter expenses he divided into five classes. The first class contained the amount of the privy purse and of the allowance granted to her majesty, and that charge he intended to retain, as it had been fixed by his predecessors at 110,000*l.*; 60,000*l.* being for the privy purse, and 50,000*l.* for the queen's allowance. The amount of the second class containing the salaries of the different officers of the household, he intended to reduce from 140,546*l.* to 130,300*l.* But the difference of 10,000*l.* was not to be considered a reduction to that amount, as he had removed from this class the salaries granted to the different officers of the Board of Works, which he thought ought to be placed under the control of Parliament, and he had abolished entirely the office of auditor of the civil list. The third class, including the expenses of the household, had been fixed by the ministry at 210,500*l.* He proposed to assign to it 161,500*l.* But this, too, was no reduction, as he had carried many of the items formerly included under this class to a different class. When he first looked at this class of expenditure, he was surprised at finding that, whilst all the articles of life had diminished so much of late years in price, the expense of maintaining the Royal Household had considerably increased. On looking more close-

ly into the matter, he had come to this conclusion, that no reduction could be made, without compelling his majesty either to alter the style of his living or to incur debt, and he was convinced that the house had no wish to compel his majesty to do either. The expense under this head had increased greatly, from the circumstance of there being at present a Queen Consort. The 4th class, which included the Royal bounties and charities, would remain as before, at 23,200*l.* In the 5th class, which comprised the pensions granted on the civil list, he had made the greatest alterations. In the proposition of the late chancellor of the Exchequer the pensions charged on the civil list for England were stated to amount to 74,200*l.*; on the civil list for Ireland they were stated to amount to 53,920*l.*, and on the civil list for Scotland to 31,050*l.*—making a total of 159,170*l.*; but the former government had intended to reduce the sum granted in the last reign for that object—to leave the English pension list at its present amount of 74,000*l.*, and to reduce the Irish pension list to 40,000*l.*, and the Scotch pension list to 30,000*l.*—making a total of 144,000*l.* Even that sum he considered too large. The proposition which he should submit would be, for uniting into one list these three distinct and separate pension lists, for he could see no advantage derivable from keeping them distinct; and that for the one pension list which he would have established in future, the house should grant 75,000*l.* Thus as the pension list of his predecessor was to have been 144,000*l.*, and as his own was only to be 75,000*l.*, there would be a reduction of 69,000*l.*, on the amount of this class. There were



only three ways of attaining this object. It might be done by not granting any more pensions, until their amount was reduced by the death of their present owners under the sum which he had fixed as the future maximum of the pension list. Such a proceeding, however, appeared to be unfair to his present majesty, for it would in all human probability take from him the power of granting any pension during his reign. The next mode was, to allow his majesty, as the pensions fell in, to grant fresh pensions, but smaller in amount, but he considered this mode liable to the same objection as the former. The mode in which he proposed to make this alteration would be, by placing the pensions on the new civil list according to the seniority of their grant, to the amount of 75,000*l.*, and by leaving the remainder to the consideration of Parliament. Those which were first placed on the civil list would, in all probability, be the oldest lives; and therefore his majesty would gain some advantage by the arrangement, but the House would not object to giving that advantage to his majesty, considering the great advantage which it would itself derive from the control which it would henceforward exercise over the pension list. There, no doubt, was another way of meeting the difficulty, and it was, with some people a favourite way, viz. to stop the pensions altogether, as having fallen by the demise of the crown. To this measure he could not accede. It was undeniable, that many of the pensions at present on the list ought never to have been granted at all. But on the best examination that he had been able to give to them, it appeared that a large majority of them were

purely pensions of charity, and therefore to take them away now, after they had been so long enjoyed, would be to inflict great distress on many individuals. He admitted that the House had a legal right to take all these pensions away, if it so pleased; they certainly had expired with the demise of the crown; but though the House had a legal right to discontinue them, he doubted whether it had an equitable right, for they had hitherto always been granted on the supposition that they were to be held not merely for the life of the sovereign who granted, but also for the life of the parties who received them.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer admitted, that the arrangement which he had detailed would be productive of scarcely any immediate saving to the public, but it was a great gain that ministers should subtract from the civil list a sum of 460,000*l.*, and place it under the control of Parliament, thus enabling the House to exercise a direct control over the diplomatic expenditure of the country, and over the salaries of various high officers, which had hitherto been protected from its supervision. He added, that no application would be made for what might have been expected in the present circumstances, a grant for the outfit of the queen, as had been done on the marriage of George III, and of the princess Charlotte. The proposition had been under the consideration of the late ministry, who did not think it unreasonable. Neither did the present ministry think it unreasonable; but when it was submitted to the king, his majesty had declined burthening the people with any grant for that object.



The members of the late government expressed their satisfaction that the present ministers, so loud against expenditure when out of office, and pledged to retrenchment when they came in, had been driven to acknowledge that they found it impossible to carry economy farther, in the matter of the civil list, than had been done by their predecessors. The new estimate was identically the same with the former, except as to the principle, whether a certain portion of the amount should be kept constantly under the control of Parliament. Even in regard to that, the difference was not so large as had been stated; for, by the civil list act it was expressly provided, that the third class of charges on the civil list, which comprised the diplomatic expenses, should be carried to the consolidated fund, and, in that way they were always under the control of Parliament. The alteration on the pension list was not intended, it was admitted, to give any immediate relief to the country: on the contrary it would increase the power of granting pensions beyond what the former ministry had contemplated, and was so contrived as to appear to do something at a future time, without touching one atom of the patronage of the present ministers. It was the senior pensions that were transferred to the civil list, thereby giving the crown the benefit of the senior lives, while the junior lives were transferred to the consolidated fund. The average amount of vacancies, on the whole civil list, as it now stood, was 7,000*l.* a-year; and the crown had the power of granting 4,800*l.* a-year. Now when 75,000*l.*, enjoyed by the oldest lives, were selected, and a calculation made, from the ordi-

nary tables, of how many were likely to die in each year, it would be found that a greater power of granting pensions was given to the crown by this than by the former arrangement. Pensions to the amount of 12,000*l.* had been granted in the year 1784, and pensions to the amount of 42,000*l.* had been granted previous to the year 1800. The result therefore was, that by this arrangement ministers conferred a greater power of granting pensions now, and their retrenchment would come into operation in other reigns, and under other administrations.

Mr. Hume, Mr. Hunt, and some other members, thought that ministers had not adhered to their promises of retrenchment in framing the estimates, especially in regard to the pensions, and insisted that government should reconsider this part of their plan. It was of no use to tell the people that most of these pensions were charitable. Charity began at home: the House was bound to be just to the people, before being generous to poor peers, or the poor relations of wealthy peers. There was scarcely the name of a person in the list who could justify his pension by services of any kind; their only claim apparently being, that they were the friends and connections of ministers, or of persons possessing parliamentary influence. Mr. Hume proposed that the persons now in the receipt of pensions, and who might be said to have some claim to them, should receive for the next year the one half of the pensions originally given to them; that they should be reduced in the succeeding year to a quarter of the original amount; and that in the third year from the present time, all those pensions should finally



determine. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had taken credit to himself for having removed all mystification from the subject, and Mr. Hunt admitted that he had done so effectually; he had frankly told the people that, in the way of reduction of expenditure, and relief of their wants, they were to expect nothing. But if so, why was the late administration broken up, and on what principle, or for what object, was the present administration called to their places, if it was not that they intended, upon the vote on the civil list, to make great deductions? Even sir H. Parnell expressed his disappointment, that the estimate effected no real reduction below that of the late government, and he regretted that ministers had exhibited a want of attention to the strict principles of economy.

The select committee on the civil list, to which the estimate was referred, had no power to examine witnesses, or send for papers; and for their information on the points to which they directed their inquiries, they had to be principally indebted to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, while it was the evident interest of ministers to prevent any reduction on an estimate which they declared had been long and carefully considered, and in which they had stated they would make no alteration. The committee, however, recommended reductions on the estimate as laid before them, amounting to 11,529*l*. Of that sum 10,955*l*. fell upon the salaries of the officers of the household, and 574*l*. on the grants for the royal bounty, and alms and charities. The ministerial estimate was 510,000*l*.; the estimate approved of by the committee was 498,470*l*. When the

report, however, was brought before the House, the Chancellor of the Exchequer moved the full amount of the original estimate, and refused to accede to the recommendation of the committee. The reduction, he said, was too trifling to be of any service to the country, and to agree to it would not be treating his majesty in the way he deserved. He did not believe the country wished the civil list to be diminished by means which would be of no benefit to themselves. He was supported by his predecessor Mr. Goulburn, by Mr. Baring, sir R. Inglis, and other members in opposition, who thought it would be in the highest degree imprudent, not to say unseemly, after the crown had surrendered, at the opening of the Session, so much of the hereditary revenue, to pare down its expenditure so very closely as was now proposed, and encountering the risk of compelling it to run in debt. On the other hand, not only the uniform supporters of the word "reduction," to whatever, and in whatever circumstances it was applied, like Mr. Hume and Mr. Hunt, but many members who acted on more moderate and rational principles, like Mr. Bankes and sir George Warrender, held that the House was bound, in common consistency, to adopt the report of its committee, unless some special reason could be alleged for rejecting it. Where was the difference between refusing a committee, and pre-determining to reject its suggestions? The late ministry had presented an estimate, and refused a committee. They would stand by their estimate; the House would have a committee, and they went out. The new ministers brought down



their estimate, or rather identically the same estimate, in a different shape; it was sent to a committee; the committee reduced it; but these ministers, too, would stand by their estimate, and would not allow the committee to reduce a shilling. To have refused it would have been more respectful. The reductions could not be objected to in themselves; they took away nothing of what was necessary for the dignity of the crown, or the personal comfort of his majesty. They merely diminished the salaries of certain great officers. The opinion of the committee must be taken as decisive that the reduction was reasonable and proper, at least to this extent, that those who maintained that the judgment of the committee was erroneous, were bound to show in what respect it was improper and unreasonable; but that had not even been attempted. The sum was said to be small; but the principle was important both to the country, and to the character of the government.

The resolution was allowed to pass; but on the third reading of the civil list bill, founded on the resolutions, after an amendment which went to confirm the report of the committee, in deducting 11,500*l.* from the class which contained the salaries of the great household officers, and transferring it to the third class, and which, therefore, effected no reduction, had been withdrawn, another was moved, that the same sum should be absolutely deducted; but the sentiments of the House being decidedly against it, it was not pressed to a division. On the same occasion, Mr. Hume who, as a member of the committee, had in vain tried to induce it to recom-

mend a deduction of 75,000*l.* on the pension list, moved it as an amendment in the House. But, on a division, his motion found only seventeen supporters against seventy-two. He then moved, when the allowances to the dukes of Cumberland, Sussex, and Cambridge came in question, that the sum proposed should be diminished one third, because the salaries of public officers were in the course of being reduced, and prices were returning to the rates of 1792, and were already below those of 1806, at which period these allowances had been increased; and he was in no small degree surprised, when the Chancellor of the Exchequer informed him, that what he proposed could not be done without repealing an act of Parliament, as the 10th George III. empowered his majesty to divide 60,000*l.* per annum among his younger children. That sum had been charged on the hereditary revenue, and it was not in the king's power to give it up without a similar provision being made on the civil list. No opposition was offered to a resolution, moved in consequence of a royal message, assigning to the queen, in case she should survive his majesty, 100,000*l.* per annum, with Bushey-park and Marlborough-house as town and country residences.

Another point on which ministers had to encounter the opposition of old friends, and received the support of former antagonists was, a proposition which they found themselves bound in prudence to make to increase the army by 7,680 men. At first sight it was a strange mode of fulfilling the pledges to retrenchment by which they had bound themselves on accepting office, and there was



none more capable of being abused to cover them with odium. They were the more entitled, therefore, to credit for doing what they believed the public safety required, and they were in this happy situation, that they had only to speak of the reform which they were to introduce, and which would be endangered by opposing them; in order to make errors appear virtues, or at least to secure for them silent acquiescence. In moving the increase, Mr. Wynn, the secretary at war, stated that it had no connection with continental affairs. It arose from no wish on the part of ministers that this country should interfere in the affairs of foreign nations; it was not the result of any thing that had taken place on the Continent, nor was it proposed under the contemplation of the necessity of any interference on the part of this country, in consequence of the events that had happened there; but no man could look to the state in which England, and, he would add, Ireland, were, when ministers were called to the administration of public affairs, and deny that the state of both kingdoms afforded sufficient cause for the proposed addition to our military force. The House had only to recollect the scenes which were going forward in several parts of the kingdom during the last few months. In such a state of things as then existed, the first consideration and the paramount duty to which government had to attend, was to afford protection to the loyal portion of the population who were exposed to attacks, and had been placed in imminent peril. He should rejoice, if the causes, which justified the present increase in the army, should soon cease to exist; and if we should be enabled, even before

the expiration of the present year, to effect a diminution in the army estimates. In the present state of the country, however, he felt that the Government would not do their duty, if they did not call for an augmentation of our military force.

Sir H. Hardinge entirely concurred in the proposition, both as to the increase, and the mode of recruiting, and thought, moreover, that government deserved great credit for the encouragement which they seemed inclined to give to the yeomanry. There was sufficient reason to justify the augmentation both at home and abroad. When he found it stated by the French minister, in the chamber of deputies, that of an expenditure of 47,000,000*l.* sterling, 9,000,000*l.* were for the army, which was to consist of 434,000 infantry, besides 46,000 cavalry, he saw in that extraordinary speech, which represented France as a camp, some cause for increasing an establishment:—but Mr. Wynn again stated, that government put it solely on account of the internal state of the United Kingdom. Colonel Davies moved, that the vote should be granted for only three months, in order that the estimates might be investigated by a committee, and he entered into various details to shew that many reductions of expense might be made, without diminishing improperly the effective strength of the army; but he withdrew his motion on the chancellor of the Exchequer stating that, although the secretary at war who had just entered on office,\* could not be expected to take decisive

---

\* And he did not hold it long. Mr. Wynn could not be brought to support the ministerial reform bill. He therefore resigned, and was succeeded by Sir H. Parnell, who had disapproved of the ministerial civil list.



steps at once on his own suggestions, and contrary to high military authority, still he pledged himself that the strictest inquiry should be instituted, every part of the estimates examined, and every effort made to reduce them: Mr. Hume, too, said that he was sure that the people would hear with sorrow of an increase of 500,000*l.* in the expense of the army by an economizing government: that he could not conceive how ministers could propose an addition of 8,000 men, and yet talk of the army as being on a peace establishment: that, in reality, he believed the late government to have been more economical than the present: and that the speeches of ministers reminded him of the good old times of Castlereagh. However, he would not divide the House "as he trusted that government would yet retrace their steps, and atone for their errors by a liberal reform, which would correct all abuses, and eventually obliterate every just cause of complaint."

Mr. Hunt, who, though the most radical of all reformers, was a much less ardent admirer of the ministerial reform, which he declared would be any thing but satisfactory to the "people," was not so easily satisfied. He not only would not consent to increase the army, but moved to reduce it to 71,000 being 10,000 men less than it had consisted of the year before. He supported his proposition in his ordinary style of plain and fearless remark, of which it is right some memorial should be preserved, especially as Mr. Hunt had conducted himself much more reputably and sincerely in the House than had been expected from his former political habits. The conduct of ministers, he said, who took office under the strongest pledges of retrenchment, and now

came forward with an augmentation of our military force, for which the increased charges, including the charge for the yeomanry, would amount to nearly half a million sterling, could not fail to excite general dissatisfaction throughout the country. They had pleaded, as an excuse for this augmentation the disturbed state of the country, and others had pleaded the agitated condition of the Continent. The army was to be increased from 81,000 to 88,000 men, and the navy was to be increased by an additional force of 3,000 men. Now, how could such an increase be required for the maintenance of peace in the disturbed districts? If it were wanted to overawe the Continent, it was clear, that such a force was quite inadequate to such a purpose. He appealed to the House on the part of the people of England, he appealed to every man who valued the tranquillity of the country, and asked them to consider what would be the feelings of those men who declared their sufferings to be now almost beyond the tolerance of human beings, on hearing that an augmentation of force was to be made, which would, of course, render necessary an augmentation of taxation? As to the pledges of the present ministers, he had heard the right hon. baronet below him (sir R. Peel) congratulate the present ministers upon having taken up all his measures; he had seen him, with a sarcastic smile, rally them upon being converts to all his principles—he had heard him tell them that they agreed with him in all his propositions,—he had heard him say, "You've interfered with other nations, though you gave a pledge of non-intervention. You have increased the estimates, though



you gave a pledge of retrenchment ; and therefore I cannot help feeling some astonishment to know how it was that I was turned by you out of place." He could not help joining in that surprise ; and what was the defence which ministers offered to this taunting charge of the right hon. baronet? As to the charge of intervention, some of them admitted, others denied it. If they were to believe public documents, there could be no doubt that ministers had been dictating a king to Belgium. The only fault that he had to find with the Belgians was, that they did not appoint a king from their own country, or that they did not choose a president, and form themselves into a republic. That was the fault, too, of the people of France. After fighting as they did during the three glorious days of July, and sacrificing 8,000 valuable lives in defence of their liberties, he was only sorry that they had not reverted to a republic. He would move that the number of men should be reduced to 71,000, unless he should hear stronger reasons than had hitherto been alleged to prove the necessity of the proposed augmentation. He would move that amendment at all events ; and if any gentleman would second it, he would divide the House upon it. He had already divided in one small minority, and he had no objection to do so again ; for he was

anxious that the people of England should know, who the parties were who would continue our present establishments at an expense of 15,000,000*l.* and who would not. It was a singular spectacle to see how gentlemen who went from the opposition to the ministerial side of the House changed their opinions with their seats, just as if there had been some atmosphere about the ministerial benches which rendered such a change inevitable. He had not heard one word, from any member who had yet spoken, that convinced him of the necessity either of increasing the army or of keeping it up to its present amount. If we were in such a dreadful state at home as to require 88,000 men to keep the people of England in quiet subjection, what was the cause which had produced such an effect? Were the people of England so altered that the government durst not trust them with arms ; the people of England were not altered, but such alterations had been made in their habits, and their institutions, by the bad laws of that House, that the government durst not put arms into their hands. Place arms in their hands, and you would have, to a certainty, reform in three months. Mr. Hunt's amendment was seconded, and the House divided ; but he could muster only 6 votes against 250 for the original motion.



## C H A P. VI.

*General Election—Popular Excitement in Favour of the Bill—Pledges demanded from Candidates—Election Riots—Result of the Election—Opening of the New Parliament—Discussions on the Address—Reform Bill brought in, and read a First Time—Clamour of the Reformers against the limitation of the £10 Franchise—Ministers yield the Point—Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill—Second Reading carried by a Majority of 136—Discussion in regard to Appleby—The House determines that it shall not be allowed to bring Evidence of its Population—Debate and Divisions on the Motion for going into Committee—Discussion in Committee on an Amendment that the Enfranchising Clauses should be first considered—Division on the Question whether all Boroughs having fewer than 2,000 Inhabitants should be disfranchised—Motion that the Boroughs proposed to be disfranchised shall be divided into Districts returning Members—Motion that the Population be taken according to the Census of 1831 instead of 1821.*

THE election of the new parliament took place amid a general excitement, which insured the success of the ministry. The declared intention of the dissolution had been, to obtain from the people a House of Commons pledged to support the reform bill; and the only test by which candidates were tried was, their determination to support that particular measure. The large bribe of political power which it held out—the inefficiency to which it was to reduce the aristocracy—the undefined, but most groundless notions, of plenty and comfort, which were artfully connected with its enactment—the infallible means which its success would create of attaining ulterior objects still more flattering to vanity and passion—the sure prospect of seizing the wealth of the church to apply it to what popular justice might reckon more

useful purposes—the light in which even its most educated supporters uniformly taught unthinking men to consider it, as being merely a generous, a reasonable, and a moderate, though firm, attempt to recover ancient rights from the grasp of profligate and usurping oppressors—these were all considerations which, addressing themselves to ignorance, prejudice, and selfishness, roused in its favour the enthusiasm, or rather the fury, of the multitude. The people were told, that the political power which the bill would bestow was their unalienable right—and no proposition can men be brought more easily to credit. They were called on to vindicate these rights by breaking their chains on the oppressors heads—and to no call, especially when it is not a summons to any dangerous exploit, will men more readily respond.



They were assured, - that the choice, which they were now to make, was one between freedom, and peace, and plenty, if the bill were carried ; and slavery, confusion, and miserable poverty, if his majesty's ministers should be dismissed from their offices. No limits can be fixed to the effects which may be produced on the large mass of any population by the promise of power, founded on the assurance that they have all the qualities which deserve it ; when they are assured that to obtain it, they have only to demand it ; and when, in doing so, they are not resisting the government of the country, but have that government itself for their leader in pressing onwards to the political Eldorado.

Of the men, again, who understood truly the state of the question, viz. will the proposed increase of the efficiency of the democratic part of the constitution better serve the ends of good government ? from what practical evils will it save us, and what hitherto unknown practical good will it bestow ?—the men who would have treated it as a question to be determined, not by declamatory appeals to passion and prejudice, but by the principles of calm reason and the results of experience—of these, great numbers were too timid, and disinclined to exertion, to engage actively in a contest which they thought would be hopeless, and many even joined, against their own convictions, the ranks of the reformers, because they believed the popular enthusiasm to be now so highly excited, however recklessly and ruinously, that disappointment would terminate in some civil commotion still more mischievous than any

effects which could follow, at least in their time, from the passing of the bill. Among the lower class of electors, again, more especially in the counties, their old and sound feelings of loyalty were made to produce the effect which could not have been brought out by any theory of reform. From the moment the bill was introduced, ministers had taken care—and their organs of the press, and their partisans at reform meetings, had well seconded their efforts—to announce, that the bill was not merely their measure, but a measure of the king. The antagonists of the bill, therefore, were represented, not merely as the corrupt and profligate enemies of the liberties of the people, but as dangerous and audacious contemners of the loyalty which they owed to the monarch. By an unprecedented change of position, the demagogues of the people made the king's will their watchword ; and the men who opposed this measure, because they saw in the democracy which it constituted, the highest peril of the crown, were hunted down by the avowed champions of popular sovereignty as being guilty of the atrocious crime of resisting the personal wishes of the sovereign. To one division of the people, the king was blown up into popularity, because he approved of the bill ; and to another, the bill was blown up into popularity, because it was the bill of the king. Electors said to candidates who had long represented them, that they could no longer vote for them, not because they were against the bill, but because they were against the king ; that they themselves did not know much about the bill, but it was the king's bill, and they must have no disloyal representatives.



Nor was it sufficient to save a candidate from the storm which had been raised, that he should be willing to lend his mind to the reform of the representation. It was demanded of him, that he should pledge himself in every thing to this particular measure. The Shibboleth now was, "the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill." The candidate was not to be sent to parliament to exercise his understanding, as a reformer, on the principles of reform which ought to be applied, and the manner of their application. He was taken, specially bound to give up the power of thinking, to renounce all exercise of the understanding, if he should be burdened with such an incumbrance, and to retain merely the power of saying yes to every proposition which ministers might make in order to carry through the particular plan which had been already proposed. The new House of Commons was not to be a deliberative body, chosen to decide on great measures of public policy; it was to be nothing more than an assembly of delegates, nominated as a mere organ by which the popular sanction might be given to a ministerial proposal. One consequence of this was, that candidates decidedly favourable to reform, were placed at the hustings, on the same level with men opposed to all reform. Printed lists of the majority and minority on general Gascoyne's motion were assiduously circulated through the country, and every candidate, whose name was found in the majority, was denounced as an enemy of reform, in defiance of the fact, that the majority had been made up by the votes of members who were determined to support the bill, and who

certainly had not deserted any one of its principles in wishing that the number of the representatives should not be diminished. But such a vote, though not hostile to reform, was a vote in favour of something which ministers would rather have had otherwise; and their policy was, to be supported by a majority which should have no power of differing from them in aught, or of shewing, by leaving them in a minority on any one point, that they might be fallible.\* The question raised at the election was not, whether the power of the democracy ought to be increased, but whether it ought to be increased in the manner proposed by ministers. The electors were requested, not to choose legislators, but to be legislators themselves; not to elect men to whose understandings they could trust, but to select speaking-trumpets, on whose voices they could rely. A question, requiring more than any other the calm deliberation of enlightened and educated minds, accustomed to weigh the merits, and watch the results, of political institutions, was decided by large bodies of excited electors, amid the tumult, riot, and license, of the unexpected Saturnalia.

The official influence of the ministers, too, which never wants its weight under any government, was put forth so unsparingly and un-

\* Hence the words Reformers and Anti-reformers are the farthest possible removed from correctly designating the tenets of the parties as they now existed; for a man, so far from being an anti-reformer, might have been, all his days, a friend to rendering the representation more popular, though he might be much disinclined to the provisions of this bill. The question raised, in regard to the bill, was one of degree and manner; the words Reformer and Anti-reformer marked a question of quality.



blushingly, as, in some instances, to defeat its own object. In Ireland, two pledged supporters of the bill were elected for the city of Dublin. The losing candidates petitioned against the return, and it came out in the proceedings before the committee, that the vice-regal government had interfered directly to ensure the success of the sitting members. The officials of the lord lieutenant had been directed to inform the electors, that all persons employed by him were requested, and all persons in the pay of his majesty's government were expected, to vote for the reform candidates. The decision of the committee found that the sitting members had not been duly elected, and that there had been an unconstitutional interference of the servants of government. On a new election, two members were returned, hostile to ministers and to the bill. All over the kingdom, the tumult and license which usually characterize a general election were more than ordinarily rampant and intolerant, and those whose occupation it is, on such occasions, to indulge in high excesses were all on one side. Anti-bill candidates and their supporters, were exposed to the most lawless violence, wherever they dared to shew themselves at the hustings; denounced on the one hand as oppressors of the people, and on the other as disloyal opponents of the crown. In some instances, as at Wigan in Lancashire, the life, as well as the property, of unpopular men was sacrificed. In Scotland, however, more than any where else, were the elections attempted to be controlled by the violence of riotous mobs. On the days of election, the county towns were occupied by large bodies of the lowest

orders of the people, marching in regular array, for the ostensible purpose of merely manifesting their anxiety that a reform candidate should succeed, but with the true object of intimidating, by the dread of violence, the defenceless electors who might be otherwise inclined. If the election terminated favourably for a candidate hostile to the bill, the assembled mob forthwith resorted to acts of violence against the voters: at the election for the county of Lanark, the late member, who as such presided at the meeting, and was adverse to the bill, was attacked with stones and other missiles, from the gallery of the church in which the election was taking place, during the very time that the proceedings were going on; he was re-elected. After the election, the voters for the successful candidate were detained prisoners for some hours, unable to encounter the ferocious mob which awaited them without, till they obtained security by the sheriff calling in the assistance of the military. At Dumbarton where, likewise, the successful candidate for the county was opposed to the bill, he had to lie for several hours concealed in a garret, till the mob, believing he had escaped, gradually dispersed. At Ayr, notwithstanding the presence of military, the successful candidate and his voters were severely wounded by the showers of stones with which the rabble assailed them, and when they had at last escaped, the popular patriots paraded the city and suburbs, venting their vengeance on the houses and property of the electors who had voted against the bill-man. The election for the Haddington district of boroughs depended on the nomination of a delegate for Lauder,



The town-council of that borough were supposed to be equally divided. On the day of nomination, the reforming rabble beset the town-hall, seized one of the councillors in the opposite interest when on his way to discharge his duty, forced him into a post-chaise which had been prepared for the purpose, and carried him off. The result was, the reform candidate carried the nomination of a delegate, and consequently the election. Some of the parties engaged in this outrage having been apprehended, the mob again rose, and compelled the civil authorities to set their companions at liberty. In Edinburgh, Mr. Dundas, the late member, had secured a majority of the council. The Lord Advocate had started as a candidate on the bill interest, and on the much better ground of his own professional and literary eminence; meetings were held, and petitions to the magistrates in his favour were gotten up by his friends. A Lord Advocate ought never to expose himself to the violence of a contest, especially in times of great public excitement; for his office imposes on him the peculiar charge of preserving the public peace; and, if outrages are committed, he is expected, and, by his duty he is bound, to prosecute the violence which has been used by his own supporters on his own behalf. The Lord Advocate, although he must have been aware that the election was decided, attended, surrounded by his friends, while an outrageous mob crowded the street without. After the election, the populace waited the coming forth of the lord Provost, attacked him with great personal violence, attempted to hurl him over the parapet of the north bridge, and were prevented

from proceeding to farther outrages only by the interference of the military. The mob continued congregated during the evening, and shewed themselves bent on further mischief. The military were again called out, but the lord Advocate ordered them to be withdrawn, pledging himself that, in that event, the populace would be quiet. The populace drew him home in his carriage, and immediately bandied themselves for new disorders and fresh attacks upon property, which continued to keep the city in tumult and alarm till late in the night, and were at last put down only by the renewed interference of the military.

Amid an excitement which, among the rabble of reformers, led to scenes like these, and which reduced even the better classes of reformers to speak of these scenes in very palliating language, it was not surprising that the great majority of the elections terminated every where in favour of the ministerial and reforming candidates. In the counties and open boroughs it was a triumph to the anti-reformers if they could carry one out of two members; even that was, in the great majority of instances, beyond their power; and where they succeeded, their candidate had sometimes to declare himself a reformer, though not a bill-man. General Gascoyne found it impossible to make head in Liverpool. Sir R. Vyvyan was expelled from Cornwall; Sir Edward Knatchbull resigned the county of Kent. Sir Robert Wilson, an ultra-reformer, but who had dared to think that it was not reform to diminish the number of the representatives, durst not shew his face in Southwark, where he was succeeded by a brother of the new



lord Chancellor. In Dorsetshire, Mr. Bankes was defeated by Mr. Calcraft, whose sudden and unexplained conversion to the doctrines of Ministers had carried the second reading of the bill. His inglorious triumph was soon afterwards followed by a death inflicted by his own hand. Without a contest four bill-men were returned for Yorkshire, the conservative party dreading either the expense or the tumult of a conflict. In Westmoreland, lord Lowther could carry only one seat, and none at all in Cumberland or in Carlisle. In London, all the four members were pledged to the bill; Mr. Ward, notwithstanding all his character and talent, being compelled to withdraw by his committee, who trembled for their own personal safety and his. The whole influence of the Duke of Newcastle was overturned at Newark, as well as in Bassetlaw and the county of Notts. Even Sir Thomas Acland, not because he was an anti-reformer, but because he would not bind himself down to "the bill," was compelled to retire from the county of Devon. On the other hand, two anti-reformers kept possession of the ministerial borough of Harwich; while the university of Cambridge expelled its bill members, Lord Palmerston and Mr. Cavendish, and returned Mr. Goulburn, and Mr. W. Peel. Out of the eighty-two county members for England, all were pledged to the bill with the exception of about half a dozen, returned by the counties of Westmoreland, Monmouth, Bucks, Huntingdon and Salop. But the reformers fell into a great mistake when they represented the issue of the county elections as decisive evidence of the unanimity of the county. The returns were secured

by the majority, however small; but the question of unanimity depended on the comparative numbers of the majority and minority; and the state of the polls, in the contested counties, left in favour of the bill-men a preponderance of about 2,000, which rendered the very idea of any thing like unanimity ridiculous. Ministers, however, had thus succeeded in obtaining a House of Commons fashioned after their own mind; but one consequence of its being a mere assemblage of pledged delegates, deprived before hand of all right to think, while it gave them a majority, gave them one than which no equal number of men had ever sat in the British parliament possessing so small a quantity of aggregate character and talent. He was the man of the people who would tie himself down to implicit obedience; and that quality was easily found among the servile, the ignorant, and the stupid.

The new parliament met on the 14th of June, being opened, in the mean time, by commission, till the preliminary forms necessary to be gone through in the House of Commons should have been completed. On the same day Mr. Manners Sutton was re-elected Speaker without opposition. On the following day his election was confirmed, in the usual manner, by the Lord Chancellor in the name of his Majesty in the House of Lords, when the newly chosen Speaker made the usual demand for the protection of the rights and privileges of the Commons, and received the usual answer. The intervening days till the 21st were occupied in swearing in members; and, on the 21st, the session was opened by his Majesty in person, the following Speech:



“My Lords and Gentlemen;

“I have availed myself of the earliest opportunity of resorting to your advice and assistance, after the dissolution of the late Parliament.

“Having had recourse to that measure for the purpose of ascertaining the sense of my people on the expediency of a Reform in the representation, I have now to recommend that important question to your earliest and most attentive consideration, confident that in any measures which you may propose for its adjustment you will carefully adhere to the acknowledged principles of the Constitution, by which the prerogative of the Crown, the authority of both Houses of Parliament, and the rights and liberties of the people, are equally secured.

“The assurances of a friendly disposition, which I continue to receive from all Foreign Powers, encourage the hope that, notwithstanding the civil commotions, which have disturbed some parts of Europe, and the contests now existing in Poland, the general peace will be maintained. To the preservation of this blessing my most anxious care will be constantly directed.

“The discussions which have taken place on the affairs of Belgium have not yet been brought to a conclusion, but the most complete agreement continues to subsist between the Powers whose Plenipotentiaries have been engaged in the conferences of London. The principle on which these conferences have been conducted, has been that of not interfering with the right of the people of Belgium to regulate their internal affairs, and to establish their Government according to their own

views of what may be most conducive to their future welfare and independence, under the sole condition, sanctioned by the practices of nations, and founded on the principles of public law, that, in the exercise of that undoubted right, the security of neighbouring states should not be endangered.

“A series of injuries and insults, for which, notwithstanding repeated remonstrances, all reparation was withheld, compelled me at last to order a squadron of my fleet to appear before Lisbon, with a peremptory demand of satisfaction. A prompt compliance with that demand prevented the necessity of further measures, but I have not yet been enabled to re-establish my diplomatic relations with the Portuguese Government.

“Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

“I have ordered estimates of the expenses of the current year to be laid before you, and I rely with confidence on your loyalty and zeal to make adequate provision for the public service, as well as for the future application of the sum granted by the last parliament; always keeping in view the necessity of a wise and wholesome economy in every branch of the public expenditure.

“My Lords and Gentlemen,

“It gives me great satisfaction to state to you, that the large reduction of taxes which took place in the last and in the present year, with a view to the relief of the labouring classes of the community, has not been attended with a proportionate diminution of the public income. I trust that such additional means as may be required to supply a part of the deficiency occasioned by these reductions,



may be found without any abridgment of the comforts of my people.

“To assist the industry, to improve the resources, and to maintain the credit of the country on sound principles, and on a safe and lasting foundation, will be at all times the object of my solicitude, in the promotion of which I look with confidence to your zealous co-operation.

“It is with deep concern that I have to announce to you the progress of a formidable disease, to which my attention had been early directed, in the eastern parts of Europe. Information having been recently received that it had extended its ravages to ports in the Baltic, from whence there is a great commercial intercourse with my dominions, I have directed that all the precautions should be taken which experience has recommended as most effectual for guarding against the introduction of so dangerous a malady into this country.

“Great distress has unhappily prevailed in some districts, and more particularly in part of the western counties of Ireland, to relieve which, in the most pressing cases, I have not hesitated to authorize the application of such means as were immediately available for that purpose. But assistance of this nature is necessarily limited in its amount, and can only be temporary in its effect.—The possibility, therefore, of introducing any measures which, by assisting the improvement of the natural resources of the country, may tend to prevent the recurrence of such evils, must be a subject of the most anxious interest to me, and to you of the most grave and cautious consideration. Local disturbances, unconnected with political causes, have taken place both

in this part of the United Kingdom and in Ireland. In the county of Clare, and in the adjoining parts of Roscommon and Galway, a system of violence and outrage had for some time been carried on to an alarming extent, for the repression of which the constitutional authority of the law has been rigorously and successfully exerted. By these means, the necessity of enacting new laws to strengthen the executive Government with further powers will, I trust, be prevented. To avert such a necessity has been, and ever will be, my most earnest desire; but if it should unfortunately arise, I do not doubt your firm resolution to maintain the peace and order of society by the adoption of such measures as may be required for their most effectual protection.”

To the Address, which was moved in the House of Lords by the Duke of Norfolk, and seconded by Lord Mulgrave, no amendment was proposed. Earl Grey stated, that, in framing the Speech and Address, Ministers had felt desirous of raising as few objections as possible, and they had therefore omitted all debateable matter that could be avoided. The discussion which did take place turned more on what was not contained in the speech—the dissolution, the alleged inattention of government to the security of property during the London illuminations, and the arts used to inflame the public mind during the election. Lord Wharncliffe adverted particularly to the statement of the Lord Chancellor, at the moment of the dissolution, that that event had become necessary as the House of Commons had refused the supplies. This statement, Lord Wharncliffe said, must be presumed to have



obtained credence with the Lord Chancellor through some unaccountable perversion of mind, for it was entirely contrary to the fact. It was, in reality, as untrue as any thing which had ever been uttered in either House of Parliament; and he had therefore looked forward with some anxiety to the time when he could legitimately call on him for an explanation. "What!" said the noble and learned Lord, "shall any one pretend to assert that the king has not an undoubted right to resort to his royal prerogative of dissolving Parliament, when the House of Commons have adopted the unprecedented course of refusing the supplies?" Now this was decidedly untrue, for they were not even presented with an opportunity of refusing the supplies. The ordinance estimates were, indeed, to have been brought forward on that day, but they had not come on prior to the division against Ministers; so that the imputation of such an offence (for an offence it would be, if they were influenced by factious motives) was undeservedly prejudicial to the anti-reform members in its effects. False as it was, it had served the turn at the general election; for a number of cases had occurred, within his own knowledge, in which it had been objected to candidates, who had been in the majority in that division, that they had refused the supplies. If there had been any intemperance of feeling, said the marquis of Londonderry, displayed on the day of the dissolution, it was impossible for any of their lordships to forget that it arose from the Chancellor having rushed out of the House, crying that the House of Commons had stopped the supplies. Now

what was the fact? His Majesty had stated, that the reason why he dissolved the late Parliament was, his desire to appeal to the sense of his people on the subject of the reform bill. Their lordships found the same assertion made in the speech which his majesty had delivered that day. They found in both those speeches a direct contradiction to the assertion of the noble and learned lord on the woolsack; and if they wanted any further contradiction to it, they had it in the notorious fact that some of the ministers in the other House of Parliament had written down to their partisans in the country, two or three days before, stating that Government had then determined upon a dissolution. Was it, then, to be wondered at that, when they found the noble lord, who ought to be an example of decorum to that House, departing in this manner from the honest truth of the transaction, that others should feel, and be roused from their ordinary meekness on such an occasion? The Earl of Mansfield asked, whether Ministers, before the dissolution, had communicated to the king that on that very day an address against that step was to be moved, and would, as they well knew, be carried by a considerable majority? If they did, the advice they gave the king to dissolve the Parliament was bold and politic, but still indefensible; but if they did not, they were unfaithful servants, and deceived his Majesty. He well remembered the manner in which the noble and learned lord left the Woolsack on the day of the dissolution of parliament, and the look which he gave their lordships on that occasion, when he left them to join his Parthian band. The no-



ble and learned Lord told them that he was obliged to leave them to be in attendance on his majesty, who was at that moment, as was afterwards reported, as far distant as the Horse Guards. Before the noble and learned lord left the house on that occasion, he said that he had never before heard it doubted that the king had a right to dissolve the parliament, and that the measure was absolutely necessary when the Commons resorted to the unprecedented proceeding of stopping the supplies. Lord Mansfield doubted whether the dissolution of Parliament, was the only measure to which ministers could have resorted. One of two things was necessary—either the dissolution of parliament or the dismissal of ministers. It was rather singular that ministers grounded the dissolution on the only measure in the session on which they, and not their political adversaries, had the majority. The statement relative to stopping the supplies was circulated through the country, and produced a great effect. The topic had been dwelt upon by the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the right hon. member for Cumberland in their addresses to their constituents.

The same peers animadverted strongly on the conduct of government in neither interfering to prevent the illumination, nor in taking any measures for the protection of property; which proved, if not their willingness to identify themselves with the propagators of public alarm; at least a great unwillingness to act with promptitude and energy in repressing intimidation, or to expose themselves to the risk of seeing themselves depreciated in the mar-

ket of vulgar popularity. The lord mayor had not done his duty in lending his authority to public rejoicings in a matter of political differences, where the necessary result could not but be, that all who thought one way would be compelled, either to belie their opinions, or have their property destroyed. The lord mayor was, no doubt, an important personage in the city; but still there was power enough in the executive government to have compelled him to act with prudence. The Earl of Mansfield stated, he had himself called on the Home Secretary; on learning that an illumination was intended: the Home Secretary even then expressed to him his disapprobation of illuminations, and the tyranny with which they were accompanied, but said, he had no control over the lord mayor. In one sense that might be true; but it was equally true that the executive government could give even the lord mayor of London good advice in such a manner as would not fail to be effectual. This advice, if given at all, had not been pressed as it ought to have been, the more especially as the lord mayor on the one hand had admitted his inability to protect houses in the city, and the Home Secretary, on the other, had expressed his belief, that the police would be insufficient to prevent windows from being broken in the west end of the town. It was their bounden duty, not only as public officers, but as good citizens and honourable combatants, to have done all in their power to prevent an exhibition of party spirit, even though that party was their own, which they knew would terminate in violating all law,



breaking the public peace, and destroying the property of their political opponents.

Viscount Melbourne, the Home Secretary, defended the government from the imputation of having either encouraged the illumination, or been inattentive to the protection of property when it did take place. He had learned, on the Monday, from the lord mayor, that there was a strong and general desire among the citizens to have an illumination in the city, in consequence of his majesty having dissolved the Parliament, and the lord mayor in reply had declared his readiness to illuminate the Mansion house. This was to be on the Monday. It appeared, however, subsequently that the preparations for the illumination could not be completed on the Monday; and then, at the desire of his fellow citizens, the lord mayor issued a notice that the illumination should be postponed to the Wednesday. That was the only notice which was issued from the Mansion-house. There had, indeed, appeared in one of the papers, a proclamation, professing to be issued by the lord mayor, which, if it had been issued by him, would, beyond all question, have been a flagrant dereliction of his duty. In that proclamation it was stated as by the lord mayor, that the police of the city had received orders to give no protection to the property of those persons who refused to illuminate. That proclamation, he it observed, the lord mayor never issued: who did issue it was a matter of uncertainty. The only notice that the lord mayor issued was that which postponed the illumination from the Monday to the Wednesday. He, the Home

Secretary, had communicated with the lord mayor on this subject, and the lord mayor had told him that there was such a desire in the city for an illumination, that he did not think that he should be able to control it, and that he therefore considered it better to yield to it. At the same time he (lord Melbourne) did not know how he could control the illumination. An illumination was not illegal: it was a ceremony he disliked to see; he disliked the arbitrary tyranny which generally took place during its progress. He had never seen any illumination without the same destruction of property which had taken place at the last; and he did not recollect that this morbid sensibility had ever been displayed about it before. He had given instructions to the police to protect the persons and property of all persons who were unwilling to illuminate, and he had every reason to believe that they performed that duty as well as circumstances and their numbers would permit. It was difficult to prevent windows from being broken, especially when there was some darkness in a neighbourhood from a number of houses being unlighted. At the same time with the difficulty of preventing the offence, the difficulty of securing the offender was increased.

The Lord Chancellor proceeded to defend himself against the charge of having stated the refusal of the House of Commons to vote the supplies as the reason for dissolving Parliament, and he was proceeding, to the no small surprise of the House, to deny that he had ever made any such statement. "If I did make that statement," said he, "I must have been the



veriest idiot that ever yet rose to address a public assembly, for a debate had raged in the House of Commons on the subject of the expected dissolution of Parliament for five hours before the vote in question occurred. Did I not know that I had previously advised the king to dissolve the Parliament? Was not the fact known to half-a-dozen people in this room? Had I not issued orders for preparing a commission the night before, it being very much on the cards that Parliament would be dissolved that evening? I shall tell the House what I said. The words made use of were so obvious, their meaning was so distinct and plain, that it was astonishing they could be misunderstood. The only meaning which my words conveyed was, that the dissolution being a thing resolved upon, if any justification of that step were necessary, it might be found in the conduct of the House of Commons on the preceding evening. Though I am not bound to do so, yet I will adopt the report of my observations which has been read. His lordship then took the printed report and read as follows:—"I never until now heard that the king had not the right to dissolve Parliament when he saw fit, the more particularly when the House of Commons have considered it proper to take the extreme and unprecedented step of refusing the supplies." I am sure that any twelve men who read those words, and who were acquainted with the circumstances under which they were spoken, would put the same construction upon them that I do. It matters little, whether in technical terms the House of Commons refused the supplies or whether they

adjourned without discussing them. The effect was the same. If a man went to borrow money from another, it was the same to him whether the latter shut the door in his face and told him he would lend none, or whether, without saying a word, he walked away, adjourned himself, and left his friend to look at the walls instead of the cash."

In the House of Commons, where the address was moved by the hon. Charles Pelham, and seconded by sir J. Johnstone, one of the members for Yorkshire, the same topics were discussed; the conduct of ministers in advising the dissolution being attacked by sir R. Peel, Mr. Attwood, Mr. Dawson, and other members, and defended by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, sir James Graham, and Mr. Stanley. The ministers admitted that the majority against them on the question of adjournment was not a refusal of the supplies, though it went to delay the voting of the ordnance estimates, and they admitted that it was not the cause of the dissolution, which had been previously resolved on. "I do not state," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "that the adjournment was the actual cause of the dissolution; but it proved that, with a House in such a state it was impossible for ministers to go on, and if it was not the cause, it was at least a justification of the dissolution." On the other hand, the statement of sir James Graham seemed to imply that the adjournment would have delayed the execution of the resolution to dissolve already adopted, if ministers had not unexpectedly found themselves in possession of monies which enabled them to go on without the ordnance votes.



He admitted that ministers had determined to dissolve even before the discussion which terminated in the adjournment being carried had been stated; and that impression was strengthened by the vote in favour of adjournment which followed. On the following morning, the morning of the day on which the dissolution actually took place, they found that there was an unappropriated surplus of money voted in the preceding year on account of the ordnance estimates, which they were enabled to make use of, and thus they avoided that exigency to which they would otherwise have been exposed. Lord Stormont asked for a direct answer to the question, whether the dissolution had not been adopted, in order to avoid the motion in the House of Lords, of which lord Wharncliffe had given notice, of an address to the king against a dissolution? No answer was given; and it was clear enough that the objection of ministers to the adjournment, did not lie in its delaying, for a day or two, the ordnance estimates, but in this, that a day's delay would have left time for the discussion of lord Wharncliffe's motion, on which they were sure to be defeated.

The House of Commons having been elected for the very purpose of passing a measure on which ministers were dependent for their continuance in power, no time was lost in bringing it forward. On the 24th of June, lord John Russell moved for leave to bring in a bill to amend the representation of England. It is unnecessary to repeat the grounds on which his lordship maintained, that it had become absolutely necessary to change the existing state of the representation, that the principles

on which he proposed to change it would only bring it back to what it once had been, and that the plan which ministers had concocted was in all its parts infallibly pure, rational, and useful. All the arguments which were now brought forward had been fully stated and discussed during the proceedings in the former Parliament. Neither did his lordship enter into any minute detail of the particular provisions of the bill, as they were already sufficiently known, and would be more particularly examined in the committee. Some minor points had been altered, he said, but not such as to touch the great principles, or detract from the efficiency of the leading provisions of the measure. Leaseholders for a long term of years were to be entitled to vote for counties, thus remedying a defect in the former bill, and the term necessary to give the franchise to leaseholders paying 50*l.* a year was to be seven years instead of fourteen. Two new boroughs, likewise, were to be disfranchised, although lord John Russell himself admitted that their disfranchisement was a violation of the rule laid down as the foundation of the bill. He confessed that, according to the bill, their population ought to save them from the loss of their members; but ministers nevertheless had resolved to disfranchise them, because they were too much under the influence of individuals. They were Downton and St. Germain's.

On this occasion no debate took place, sir R. Peel having stated that he did not wish to divide the House on the first reading, that he wished still less to have a long debate without a division, and that the discussion would take place

[M]



most conveniently on the second reading. For his own part, he wished but for one effectual discussion on the principles of the bill, previously to its going into committee: he spoke, however, merely as an individual. He hoped, likewise, that, before that discussion, the bills for Scotland and Ireland would be brought in, for it was material, that the House, before it discussed the English bill should know the intentions of ministers with regard to Scotland and Ireland. The king's speech had recommended the House to consider the general question of reform with reference to Ireland and to Scotland, as well as to England; and if the House proceeded to fulfil the promises they had given in the address, that they would proceed immediately to take into consideration the question of reform, they were bound in compliance with that address, not certainly to proceed with the bills *pari passu*, but still to seek to know what was to be done with respect to Ireland and Scotland.

The second reading accordingly did not take place till the 4th of July, the Irish bill having been brought in, and read a first time, on the 30th of June, and the Scotch bill on the 1st of July. During the interval a good deal of notice was excited by the mode in which ministers dealt with a very important clause which now appeared in the bill. The franchise was still a 10*l.* franchise, but the bill, as brought in, provided that persons paying a yearly rent of 10*l.* should not be entitled to vote, if their rent was payable oftener than half yearly. The effect of this would have been twofold—it would, to a certain extent, have limited the constituency, and it

might have given landlords the power of conferring the franchise on their tenants or refusing it, by accepting half yearly, or insisting on more frequent payments. A clamour was immediately raised against the clause by the reformers, and the clause was immediately sacrificed by ministers, who pretended it had crept in by inadvertence, or, at least, that they had not been aware of its probable effects. If it was deliberately introduced into the bill, it was in vain to tell the world that they had not weighed its consequences; and even if that had been true, the confession that they had made so important a provision in utter ignorance of its plain consequences, was not fitted to conciliate confidence to their handywork. When it was first noticed in the House of Commons, on the 29th June, ministers ascribed it to some technical “defects” in the wording of the clause. The ministerial organs of the press, to remove suspicion from their patrons, threw the blame on Mr. Gregson, the gentleman who had been employed to draw up the bill. This was imprudent; for Mr. Gregson's defence brought out the fact that what ministers now excused as an inadvertence had been deliberately resolved on, after their attention had been specially drawn to its necessary effects. Lord Althorpe, to whom Mr. Gregson had complained of the statements in the ministerial journals, had promised to absolve him from all blame before the house. An opportunity for doing so not having occurred, or not having been taken, Mr. Estcourt (4th July) drew the attention of the House to the subject, when lord Althorpe admitted, that the alteration in the bill had been made by the directions of ministers.



It had been made he said only with a view to render more effective the value of ten pound houses, but ministers had committed a great mistake from not being aware that the alteration would disfranchise a number of voters, and they had abandoned it as soon as they discovered that such would be the effect of it. Mr. Estcourt thinking this explanation only partially satisfactory, asked whether he was to understand, that Mr. Gregson had stated to ministers the objections which lay against the alteration, and that, notwithstanding this warning, ministers had directed him to draw up the bill as it now appeared. In answer lord John Russell admitted that Mr. Gregson did state his objections, and that he certainly did understand him to say what effect the alteration would have upon persons paying a rent sufficient to qualify them for the franchise, but paying it quarterly ; but, at the same time, Mr. Gregson did not convey to his mind the idea that the alteration would cut so deeply as it had been found it would do. Various objections had been stated to parts of the bill, in the course of preparing it, but many of them did not seem to him of any importance, and among these was the alteration in question, which had not made a greater impression on his mind than others.

The second reading of the bill was moved on the 4th of July. Sir John Walsh moved as an amendment that it should be read a second time that day six months. The debate which followed was continued during the 5th and 6th. It consisted almost entirely of a repetition of the views, the arguments, and anticipations, which had been brought out at such great length in the preceding parliament,

and with which it is unnecessary again to load our pages. The new matter of the supporters of the bill consisted principally in enlarging on what they termed the triumphant evidence with which the general election had furnished them, that all room for doubt or hesitation was now at an end ; that the voice of the people, whose representatives the House ought to be, had finally decided, not merely that there must be reform, but that kind and degree of reform contained in the ministerial bill ; that this voice had been pronounced unanimously—for the returns from close boroughs, and some counties not much better were not things that could justly be taken into account in estimating the will and the wishes of those who formed the people. To this the opponents of the bill answered, that the argument drawn from the mere fact of a popular clamour having been raised in favour of this measure was fit only for legislators who had been invested with that character on no other terms than those of pledging themselves to discharge faithfully the humble duty of delegates, and not to act according to any opinions which their own minds might form regarding the necessity or the benefits of the measure to be proposed by government. No man could deny the violent excitement which had taken place ; most men would not hold that large bodies of electors were the fittest persons for deciding on the merits of so complicated and delicate a question ; and every man must concede that, least of all, could the decision of such assemblages be regarded, when made under the influence of temporary and violent agitation, sedulously cherished by false pretexts, and supported by so many



groundless anticipations. The returns could not even be considered as shewing the opinion of the country on this plan of reform, so much had they been influenced by considerations not connected with the merits of the proposition itself, and by identifying it with consequences to which those even of its friends, who were rational and candid, admitted that it never would lead. Take from the polls those who believed that in this bill were to be found the abolition of tithes and the seizure of church property—the much greater numbers who saw in it a vast reduction of taxes and the immediate increase of their personal comforts—all those who, deaf to such motives, but bribed by their very loyalty, ranged themselves round a measure which they were told was that of the king, and was opposed only by the enemies of the king—and, after such deductions, the reformers would have little cause to boast of the existence of that kind of public voice to which alone a wise and conscientious man ought to listen. Where had been the loudness and unanimity, now so vaunted, in favour of reform, before the promulgation of the present measure, and the triumphs of the democracy of France? What reforming riots had disgraced the country—what political unions had banded the people, and usurped the government—what pledges had been demanded from candidates at the preceding election? How little ministers could trust to reason and calmness among the people, and how much they reckoned on every thing that was the reverse, was manifest from the delicacy and respect with which they treated bodies that ought to have been unknown to them as a government,

except for the purpose of discountenancing them. Ministers had wisely resolved not to entrust the franchise even to 10% voters, who paid weekly, for instance. But this resolution displeased the Birmingham political union; they addressed a letter on the subject to the prime minister, and that noble lord honoured them with the most friendly recognition. “May I be permitted to ask,” said sir Charles Wetherell, “of the quoters of Selden and other great constitutional authorities, whether it was the practice of the times to which they referred for the first minister of the crown to recognize and acknowledge an usurping body of men—a self elected corporation? When was it considered in accordance with the practice and principles of the constitution for the king’s minister to recognize those who wielded an unauthorized and arbitrary power? If the Birmingham political union presented a petition to the House of Commons in that name, he might safely appeal to the Speaker whether it would be received by the House—whether it would not be rejected, because the parties transmitting it assumed a corporate character, which they had no right to take. In their individual character they had a right to state their opinion to the House, but the House would not receive a petition from them in the assumed capacity of a corporation that was not known to the law. He did, in the face of the House, charge the prime minister with a great and glaring impropriety, in recognizing, by his letter, the existence of an illegally-constituted, and falsely-assumed, corporation.”

On the other hand, it was maintained, in the first place, that, even



admitting, in the general case, the inexpediency of tying down representatives by specific pledges, yet, if ever there was a time when pledges might be admitted, it was the present. The subject of reform had now been so fully discussed, that the greater number of men were as well able to judge of its merits as most of those who were returned to parliament. The public had had the opportunity of reading all the debates upon the subject. Pledges might, therefore, be fairly required from candidates as to the support of a measure so well understood. Neither was it true that the elections had been effected by violence and excitement. Never had less of either accompanied any election; and even if it had been otherwise, how could that affect the justice and expediency of the present measure? And if violence was feared, was it not true that, whenever the people had a legal vent for their feelings, they were less likely to be violent than when they were obliged to suppress them. Give them liberty of voting, and they would seek no licence of action.

On the principle of the measure ministers and their friends repeated that, although it went farther than they had been pledged to go, it went no farther than they were convinced it was necessary and wise to go; that it was merely an application of the true principles of the constitution, in order to render it what it ought to be; that, instead of being dangerous to the stability of property, to the prerogative of the crown, or the due influence of the aristocracy, it would strengthen and consolidate them all; that, moreover, be it what it might, the country demanded it—would be satisfied with

nothing less—and, if this was refused, would soon take more. The opponents of the bill repeated, that the people had never thought of demanding this bill, until it was offered to them as a bribe to rouse them in support of a ministry which, but for that, would, soon after its creation, have paid, by its dissolution, the penalty of its radical and incurable incapacity; that, in itself, it was not reform, but the fabrication of a new constitution. It did not contain any one rule which had ever before been known to exist in the constitution. It did not remove abuses, but dealt in total destruction; it did not purify a representation which was to support a throne, but laid the deep foundations of a pure democracy, with which neither monarch nor aristocracy could long co-exist as independent parts of a political constitution. It justified its necessity by existing anomalies, and itself teemed with anomalies in all and each of its parts. It pretended to be founded on the rights of the people, and yet proceeded on no principle which was not admitted to be so absolutely arbitrary, that its very framers could not tell why they had drawn the lines which defined its operation. It was the creation of vain and selfish men, seeking what they termed sound principle, without having detected any practical evil, or being able to promise any practical good—conceited enough to imagine that their unaided wisdom could produce something far more favourable to human happiness and virtue than the British constitution, and conciliating favour to their speculations, not by addressing themselves to wisdom and reason, but by stooping to flatter and bribe the blind prejudices and



selfishness of multitudes and of demagogues.

The division shewed a majority of 136 in favour of ministers; the votes for the second reading being 367, and those for the amendment 231.

The committee had been fixed for the 12th of July. On the motion, that the Speaker should leave the chair, lord Maitland, one of the members for Appleby, called the attention of the House to the case of that borough, which, he contended, was included in schedule A—which contained the boroughs to be totally disfranchised—solely in consequence of a mistake in the population returns of 1821, which were taken as the basis of the present bill. The population of this borough, including the parishes of St. Michael and St. Lawrence, amounted, according to the returns of 1811, to 2,616; but the returns of 1821 had reduced this number considerably below 2,000, by the accidental omission of the parish of St. Lawrence. He moved, that his constituents should be heard at the bar by themselves and their counsel against the bill, in so far as it affected them, and in support of the allegations in their petition.

Ministers declared they would resist any such inquiry to the uttermost. Was the progress of this great bill to be stopped, to enter into an examination of the particular case of so insignificant a place as Appleby? Would *the majority* of that House allow themselves to be trifled with? The bill was not one of pains and penalties, and members would be heard, in committee, in regard to this and every other borough; but, if the House was to hear counsel in the case of Appleby, they might like-

wise be called on to hear them in the case of the other condemned boroughs, and that would be vexatious. The House had the information furnished by the population returns, which was sufficient. If witnesses were examined at the bar, they must necessarily, if they had not been engaged in taking the census, be unable to furnish any other evidence, and if they had been so engaged, they would furnish just the same evidence. In answer, Mr. C. Wynn, Mr. Praed, Mr. Attwood, sir E. Sugden, and Mr. Croker, maintained, that there never had been an instance of so arbitrary and unconstitutional an attempt as ministers were now making. The second reading had carried the principle of the bill; but these petitioners were not objecting to the principle; they only maintained that, adopting that principle, the rule laid down by the bill itself, and founded on a matter of fact, could not apply to them. Ministers must know, that petitions of this kind could be received only on the second reading; and that, in the committee, no petitions could be received except such as were directed against particular enactments. Was this bill not a bill of pains and penalties? They were proposing to take a valuable right (be it property or trust) from a borough upon certain grounds, which that borough declared not to be applicable to it, and claimed to be heard on the subject by counsel at the bar. Was it not just that they should be heard? Had it been usual, in former cases, for the House to point out the mode of defence to be adopted by parties attacked, and restrict them in that particular, instead of allowing them to take their own course? When



the cases of corrupt boroughs had been brought before the House, counsel were allowed to defend them at the bar; why should not a similar privilege be allowed here? Because, it was said, if they admitted the right of the borough to being heard in this case, they must also admit the right in other cases of a similar nature. Undoubtedly: and why not? Whether borough-right involved a right of property, or whether it was simply a duty, parties ought to be heard in defence of it. This borough was pure, but only asked the same advantage as it would be entitled to if it were corrupt. Let the House treat it as well as if it had qualified itself for indulgence by being impure. The borough was blameless; treat it as if it were culpable, that was all that was required. It was the bounden duty of ministers to have rendered themselves masters of the case of every borough included in either of the schedules before bringing in the bill. That they had not done so, the repeated changes made in the schedules proved—cases such as the present proved it—nay, that provision, by which three months were to be allowed for the purpose of enabling commissioners to parcel out boroughs and counties, proved ministers' ignorance of the details of their own measure. Did government claim to itself an exclusive use of the unlicensed practice of making mistakes *ad libitum*, and likewise the practice of curing those mistakes *ad libitum*? Was nobody else to point out an error, or suggest a remedy? There was sufficient evidence already, forsooth, in the population returns. It was admitted, that these returns might be erroneous; ministers allowed that; in various in-

stances, they had proved to be erroneous, and to require correction. The allegation offered to be established was, that, in relation to this borough, they were erroneous; and how could that be made out by evidence, if the petitioners were not allowed to produce it? The evidence was tendered, too, at the only time at which it could be tendered. It was certain, that the Committee could not hear evidence at the bar without the previous permission of the House, granted on a formal motion. The present motion was merely that the petitioners should be thus heard; and, if it were rejected, it was plain that the thorough investigation held out as awaiting them in the committee would be impossible. The petitioners had, weeks ago, addressed two memorials to ministers; they had stated their case as soon, and in the same manner, as Buckingham and Truro, and, as the cases were perfectly identical, expected to have been equally successful. But ministers would not listen, and that was now to be a reason why the House should not even inquire, whether the statements, on which a borough was to be deprived of the elective franchise, were true or false. Ministers were bringing down their pledged majority to vote in the dark, and, trusting to numbers, were setting at defiance all argument, precedent, and justice.

The motion, however, was rejected by a majority of 97 (284 to 187), although several supporters of the bill ventured to vote in the minority. Among these was alderman Thompson, one of the members for London, who stated, from his local knowledge of Appleby, that the petitioners were justly entitled to shew cause why they



should not be disfranchised, and that justice would not be done if the motion were rejected. The alderman was immediately called before a junta of his constituents, to answer for his audacity in having dared to support what he thought just, in opposition to ministers. In vain he assured them that he was as faithful as ever to his pledge to the bill—that he had duly voted for the second reading—that the point in dispute had not involved any principle, but simply, whether or no the facts on which it proceeded were to be taken at random, or ascertained by evidence; that the bill itself said, no borough should be totally disfranchised if its population exceeded 2,000, and he had merely wished to know whether Appleby did or did not contain that number. His hard taskmasters compelled him to express his regret for having been guilty of so great an “inadvertence” as to vote against ministers, and only on that condition, they continued their favour to the weeping, repentant, and degraded alderman. Such was the state of trembling servility to which legislators so elected were reduced, and such was the meaning of the pledges by which they were bound. Here was an English merchant compelled to express his sorrow for having opposed the commission of what he believed to be injustice, perpetrated for the purpose of suppressing what he believed to be the truth.

This motion having been lost, a new discussion arose, before the Speaker left the chair, on the general principles and tendencies of the bill. There being still several members who wished to express their sentiments, and the majority seeming impatient to cut

all argument short, Mr. Gordon, who had been interrupted by their cries for a division, moved an adjournment. The chancellor of the Exchequer refused to consent; he would have no further general argument on the bill after that night, for sir Robert Peel, when the bill was brought in, had distinctly stated, that one discussion on the second reading would be sufficient. That was true; but sir Robert had, at the same time, distinctly stated that, in saying so, he expressed only his individual opinion. The motion for the Speaker leaving the chair was carried by a majority of 328 to 102; but the minority, thinking, more especially from the treatment of Appleby in the earlier part of the evening, that there was a determination to hurry on, by means of the majority, independent of all inquiry or argument, resolved to shew at once that they were prepared, on their side, to make good the protection which the forms of the House afford to a minority. Seven different times they moved an adjournment, as an amendment to the as often repeated motion, that the Speaker should leave the chair, and divided the House. Each division was preceded by angry skirmishing, the majority insisting that the opposition was factious and unreasonable, and that the minority were bound to submit; the minority, again, maintaining that the privilege of moving an adjournment meant just the reverse, and that it was used at present for its constitutional and useful purpose of preventing a majority from stifling all discussion, and of shewing that this bill was not to be hurried through in the way which some gentlemen had anticipated. Some ministerial members advised government to



yield, as the power of moving an adjournment was the only protection which a minority enjoyed against a majority, and it always had been the practice of government, on similar occasions, to give way. Others urged the chancellor of the Exchequer not to yield an inch of ground. The Attorney-general said it was important that the government should persevere in opposing the amendment, in consequence of the manner in which the minority were abusing their privilege in moving it; for the objection to proceeding with the debate was not founded on any constitutional objections to the reform bill, but on the simple fact that an individual had felt that he had not been heard with sufficient attention at twelve o'clock at night. But the Attorney-general forgot, that it was just this fact, coupled with the Appleby discussion, which had induced the minority to shew their resolution not to be trampled down. One member desired the opposition to remember, that a day of retribution was coming—but still an adjournment was moved. Mr. Sheil declared, that when this debate went forth next day, the whole metropolis would be in a ferment; a Mr. James announced that the artisans might now hoist their black flag; and ministers themselves were, in truth, much more conciliatory than their adherents. This foolish language produced no effect. The minority, headed by sir C. Wetherell, stood upon their right, and justified the object for which they were using it. Sir Charles said, that never were amendments moved on more constitutional grounds. He and his friends were determined to secure the independence of the House,

and prevent freedom of debate from being stifled. He would continue to pursue the path which he had hitherto followed, being convinced that in that House he should be deemed to have acted the part of an independent member of parliament, though he was only the member of a rotten borough. The noble lord and his majority should have frequent opportunities of quitting the House, like a comet with its tail, and returning to a renewal of the same exercise. He and his friends would conduct their cause with the genuine sincerity of men who conscientiously believed themselves to be engaged in protecting the best interests of the country. He had already made up his mind to perseverance, and persevere he would. Government, in possession of exulting majorities, should have taken for its motto, *Parcere subjectis et debellare superbos*. But it would do no such thing. It was not content with dancing in and out of the House with a comic train of attendants, exulting and triumphing in their superiority—it must also clamour its opponents into silence. Some gentlemen then present recollected twenty of these divisions taking place in a night. When he had equalled that number, and had got a drawn battle, he might perhaps give way; but certainly not till then.

On the last division the majority counted 187 votes, and the minority 24; but as the latter kept unflinchingly to their point, and seven o'clock in the morning was approaching, the Chancellor of the Exchequer declared that he was, and always had been, anxious that the House should have the fullest opportunity to discuss the question on the evening of the day the morning of which was already so



far advanced. If the House, therefore, would allow him to go into committee *pro forma*, the chairman might report progress, and ask leave to sit again to-morrow, when the discussion might go on as before; this arrangement was agreed to, and the House adjourned at half-past seven o'clock.

On the 13th, accordingly, when the motion was made for the speaker leaving the chair, some discussion on the general principles of the bill took place, but it was very brief, the opposition apparently being satisfied with having shewn that they had resolution enough to insist on full and free discussion. In the committee, when the first clause was read, declaring that the boroughs contained in schedule A should cease to return members, Mr. C. W. Wynn moved that the consideration of this clause (and, if he succeeded, likewise of the partially disfranchising clause applicable to schedule B) should be delayed, till the clauses which bestowed members on places hitherto unrepresented should have been settled. He thought the first thing the House should do was to see what places ought to be enfranchised, and then how far other alterations must be made in order to admit them. He was disposed to agree to a considerable addition of new members; but he would first determine upon the proper number, and afterwards consider how room was to be made for them. He thought it best to make room for them, rather than to add them to the present amount of members, because it was generally acknowledged that any increase of the numbers of that House would not be attended with convenience. He was inclined to think that the best way of making room for the new members was by uniting bo-

roughs rather than disfranchising them. Why might not the boroughs of Aldborough and Orford be joined, and allowed to send representatives to Parliament conjointly, instead of being entirely extinguished? He did not see why this plan of uniting boroughs might not be acted upon as well in this country as in Scotland. This, however, could not be done, until the number of new members to be provided for was known.

Sir E. Sugden, Mr. Croker, and sir R. Peel spoke in favour of the amendment, but insisted much more largely on other points of the proposed measure, more particularly on the impossibility of discovering on what principle the disfranchisement was founded, and the folly of proceeding to disfranchise on the ground of population, upon information confessedly imperfect. Ministers at one moment had declared, that the number of the House should be diminished by sixty-two, and in another they turned round, stated that they had changed their minds, and now declared their will, relying on a majority to back them, that the decrease should be limited to thirty-one. They had taken care to exclude from the present bill the grounds upon which it proceeded; and when posterity came to inquire for what reasons this great measure was introduced, in vain would the bill be examined to discover one single ground upon which disfranchisement had taken place. When the House looked into schedule A, it would find, that ministers had made an alteration in that, in consequence of information which they had received, of the loosest description, and upon which if the members of the House acted, they would be trifling with the feelings and the rights of the people



of England. Upon the strength of certain information which ministers had laid upon the table, they had taken five boroughs, which had been condemned to entire extinction, out of schedule A, and placed them in schedule B, by which transposition they would gain a member each ; and then, as a sort of counterpoise, they took two boroughs out of schedule B and placed them in schedule A. Now when ministers brought in their first bill, did they or did they not proceed upon sufficient grounds with respect to disfranchisement? That they did not, was now perfectly evident from the alterations which had been made ; and certainly more caution ought to be used in proposing so great, so radical, a change in the constitution. The present principle, it was said, was to abolish nomination boroughs, but the principle of the bill originally was, that inconsiderable and decayed boroughs only were to be disfranchised ; but it would be found, that several boroughs were to be disfranchised which were not nomination boroughs, whilst several were not to be disfranchised which were nomination boroughs. Ministers had formerly been told, that they were retaining nomination boroughs, and thereby giving to them an increased value. What was their answer? That they never intended to interfere with the rights of legitimate property. So that, in point of principle, it was not nomination boroughs they were to do away, but small and decayed boroughs. They had boasted that property was the basis of this bill. While ministers were hatching the bill in the cabinet, the member for Shrewsbury, unaware of what would be put into this great exemplar of wisdom, introduced a bill to

exempt from the payment of poor-rates the inhabitants of 10*l.* houses, —the very persons who were to be raised to the distinction of electors. That bill stood for the second reading the very night on which the noble lord brought in a bill, by which 10*l.* householders were to be raised from the state of paupers, and erected into independent legislators of the country. And now to the farce of the transaction. The hon. member's bill, as it originally stood, provided that the occupier of houses under 12*l.* rent should not be called on to pay poor-rates, and that the payment of these rates should be transferred to the landlord. This, of course, was intended to include houses of 10*l.* But the limit had been since altered to 10*l.*, and there were actually two bills going through the House *pari passu*, by one of which a 10*l.* householder had a legitimate vote for a representative in the reformed parliament, and by the other bill he was declared a pauper, or only one degree above a pauper. For the sake of the bill itself, said sir R. Peel, it would have been prudent in ministers to have avoided calling the attention of the House so immediately to those provisions ; for whilst the bill proceeded on the doctrine of population, it was guilty of the inconceivable absurdity of having recourse to the returns of 1821, when in one fortnight the House would have been in possession of the census of 1831. This alone would make the difference of excluding many boroughs which otherwise would have been included in the different schedules. Ministers take population as their basis, and yet admit that the returns of 1821 are imperfect. Nay, more, they not only admit that they are imperfect, but a gentleman,



whom they sent since the bill was first promulgated in the last parliament to ascertain the exact population of the towns to be enfranchised as well as disfranchised, says that "if more time were afforded him, he should be able to procure information which would essentially illustrate the operations of the bill on twenty-five of the large towns set down in schedule C," and adds his regret that "he had exceeded the period prescribed for his mission one day." What was the inference to be drawn from all this? Simply this—that ministers were not only acting on imperfect information, but would neither themselves procure the requisite information nor allow us (the Opposition) to procure it. And yet, forsooth, they plume themselves on their above-board policy. Ministers said, that they did not reckon it of much importance whether disfranchisement or enfranchisement came first, because, according to their principles, they were altogether independent of each other. They did not propose disfranchisement as a consequence of, or a thing rendered necessary by, prospective enfranchisement; but as a measure necessary and proper in itself. They took away the franchise from a small and corrupt borough, because it was not of sufficient importance to hold such a right; and they gave it to a great town because, without any reference to the disfranchisement of the small borough, its wealth and population entitled it to be represented. Ministers were prepared to assume the principle that close boroughs were evils in themselves, and ought to be got rid of. The course which the House ought to pursue was, to ascertain what boroughs ought to be disfranchised, for the principle

of the bill was to disfranchise boroughs which ought not to return members to that House, and to give representatives to those boroughs which ought to possess them. The amendment was lost by a majority of 118.

In the committee, next day, the question of total disfranchisement in regard to the boroughs contained in this first schedule was again raised by sir Robert Peel. The schedule, he said, included fifty-seven boroughs upon each of which it was competent for any member to raise a discussion, involving the consideration of the whole bill. He thought, therefore, the best course would be, to take the sense of the House on this question, whether all boroughs containing fewer than 2000 inhabitants should be disfranchised; and when the will of the House was clearly manifested by decided majorities, he for one would not be disposed to repeat the division in the case of each particular borough, upon the understanding that, with respect to every borough, where a *prima facie* case could be established that it did not fall below the line drawn by ministers, an opportunity for full discussion would be afforded. He therefore moved that the word "each" should be left out of the clause. The question thus raised was to bring out the grounds on which this arbitrary disfranchisement was rested, it having been very difficult to discover from the statements of ministers whether they aimed at nomination boroughs, or at boroughs of a smaller population than 2000, whether they were close or independent, or at population as a test of nomination. The chancellor of the Exchequer stated very briefly, that the principle which ministers had in view was to disfranchise cer-



tain nomination boroughs. Some of them were large, some of them small. All under 2000 inhabitants were to be disfranchised entirely. The others were to retain the franchise to a certain extent, but they would be thrown open. Lord John Russell declared, that the *test* was population; but if he were asked the *object* of the measure, he would say, it was to destroy nomination in every respect, and give every 10<sup>l</sup>. householder a vote. The test was, whether the boroughs did or did not contain 2000 inhabitants. It was a notorious fact that all the boroughs in schedule A were nomination boroughs.

These statements, it was answered, only shewed that the disfranchisement did not rest on any one fixed principle. The object was to get rid of nomination boroughs; well, let the object be assumed. How came the circumstance of a place containing, or rather having contained in 1821, one human being less or more than 2000 to be a test whether it was an independent or a subject borough? Nomination was a fact independent of population; it might not exist in a borough of 1,500 inhabitants, while it might exist in a borough of 3000. It might be true as a fact, though it was not, that all the boroughs in schedule A were nomination boroughs: but they were not so, *because* they contained only 2000 inhabitants. Whether or not a borough was a nomination borough was a fact to be ascertained in every case by evidence. If this was the principle, ministers were bound to exempt every borough which they could not shew to be in fact a nomination borough. If they said, no, we shall disfranchise, if it have fewer than 2000 inhabitants, whether it be a nomination borough or

not, then they brought in population, not as a test of something else, but as being in itself a substantive ground of disfranchisement. They said that all the boroughs in schedule A were nomination boroughs; yet they admitted, that, if any of them could be shewn to have contained, in 1821, 2,001 inhabitants, it would be saved. But would that access of population make it less a nomination borough? It was to be saved, then, not on the ground of its independence, but solely on the ground of population, without regard to its political character. But, say ministers, whatever line we may draw must be in its nature arbitrary. Not if you are speaking truth when you announce your principle. If population is your principle, which you say it is not, then to be sure you must be arbitrary; but if your object be to exclude every nomination borough, that is an inquiry of fact independent of population, and requiring the application of no arbitrary rule.

If the destruction of nomination boroughs be the object and principle, and population only the test, what becomes of the one or the other in boroughs of between three and four thousand inhabitants? They are to lose one member: they are to be disfranchised thus partially because they are nomination boroughs. But why partially? The principle is, to get rid of them; and yet the sentence pronounced by the principle of the bill is immediately reversed by the pretended test of that principle—population. The admission of ministers that there were nomination boroughs above, as well as below, 2000, put an end to population as a test; for no human ingenuity could conceive of 2000 and 4000 being equally tests. The one must be too low,



or the other must be too high. But these boroughs, it was said, were to be thrown open. If so, then the whole of the pretended groundwork of disfranchisement fell away;—for that was a distinct admission that disfranchisement was not necessary in order to purify a nomination borough. If a borough containing 2001 inhabitants could be rendered worthy of its privileges by the new constituency, why was not the same remedy applied to a borough with a population of 1999? How could the total disfranchisement of the one, and the partial salvation of the other, rest on the same principle? That partial salvation itself was utterly inconsistent with the avowed object and principle:—for, if the borough is to be independent with its remaining member, on what principle is it disfranchised *quoad* the other; and if it is still to be a nomination borough, with its one member, on what principle has it not been deprived of both? There was no principle either fixed or followed out, and ministers would take sometimes the fact of population and sometimes the assumption of nomination, as best suited their own views and wishes, while they proceeded with no trustworthy information as to either. Greater absurdity, said sir Robert Peel, there could not be than to allow numbers to become the test of disfranchisement. All the world knew that there were parodies on university examinations, containing such questions as this, given the name of the vessel and the height of the mast, to find out the ship's destination. No less absurd was the declared principle of this bill, if principle it might be called, viz. given the number of men, women and children in a certain place,

to find the political independence of its inhabitants. This profound problem ministers had not attempted to solve. Would they give a plain answer to these plain questions—is the House asked to affirm this proposition; all boroughs containing from 50 to 2000 inhabitants, necessarily are, simply on account of their population, nomination boroughs which cannot be purified, but must be destroyed; and all boroughs containing from 2000 to 4000 inhabitants, necessarily are, in respect of their population alone, nomination boroughs, which can be purified as to one half but cannot be purified, and must be destroyed, as to the other. Let these propositions, the necessary result of the declared principles of the bill, be distinctly stated, and the committee and the country would know what to think of the wisdom of the men who brought them forth.—The argument was answered by a division which gave ministers a majority of 97.

When Mr. Wynn proposed the postponement of the disfranchisement clauses till after it should have been determined what new boroughs were to be introduced, he had stated that room might be made for their representatives by uniting, as in Scotland, several of the smaller boroughs, instead of visiting them with disfranchisement. In pursuance of the same idea, Sir A. Agnew, a supporter of the bill, moved in the committee, on the 15th, an amendment to the effect, “that the boroughs in schedule A should have a share in the election of a member or members to serve in parliament as shall be hereinafter provided.”—the intended subsequent provision being, the conjunction of these boroughs for purposes of represent-



ation. To this proposition it was objected, in the first place, that the question was already settled. The effect of it would be, that there would be no total disfranchisement of the boroughs included under this first clause, while the House had already determined, particularly on the amendment moved by sir Robert Peel, that total disfranchisement was here to be the rule. Next, it was hostile to the principle of the bill, which was the destruction of all nomination boroughs. The proposed union would make the franchise depend on a small society of borough proprietors. These places were consigned to destruction, because they had no constituency, and how could any good be effected by combining several of them. It was impossible, by the numerical addition of such boroughs, to obtain a pure constituency; they might as well attempt to form a whole man out of so many un-grown babies. No doubt opposite influences might tend to neutralize each other, but the result would never be a true and faithful representation of the interests of the people: the extent of certain influences might be lessened, but the character of the influence would not be changed. Although, therefore, the bill itself did contain several instances of unions, for the purpose of sending members to parliament, they furnished no analogy, because these were populous districts. But the effect of the present proposal would be, to enable the patrons of two or three boroughs to carry the election for the district, and disappoint the country of the good which was expected from the destruction of the nomination boroughs.

On the other side it was main-

tained, that these objections rested on a total misconception of the proposition. They would be good, if the boroughs were to remain as they were, the influence of each patron remaining untouched, except in so far as it might be affected by that of his co-patrons. But these boroughs were not to be withdrawn, by this proposal, from those clauses of the bill which regarded the constituency. In all of them a new constituency was to be formed of 10% householders. It was impossible, therefore, that the predominating influence could remain in the manner which was objected to. By the bill itself, a borough containing, for instance, 2,400 inhabitants, was to retain a member, its constituency being placed on a certain footing. Why, then, should the same privilege be refused to the united population of four containing 600 each, or of two containing, the one 1,500, and the other 600, their constituency being placed on the same footing? The principle of schedule B was, that nomination could be destroyed by changing the constituency. If that could be done in the one case, why not in the other? It was said, that, in many of these boroughs, the number of 10% voters was altogether trivial. But when had the number of 10% houses become the principle on which these boroughs were to be dealt with? This was a new test. Nomination had been a principle; population had been a principle; now came a third, hitherto unheard of. What number of such houses was to save or damn a borough? This, if it was to be adopted, opened up an entirely new inquiry. The bill declared, that 2,100 inhabitants, living in a borough, should retain a member, without saying one word



about the number of 10 $\frac{1}{2}$ . householders among them; and the question was, why 2,100 inhabitants, living in two, or three, or five boroughs, should not have the same privilege? Will union and a new constituency secure against nomination? That was the point. Ministers themselves had answered unanimously in the affirmative, in their own Reform Bill for Scotland. There the boroughs elected by districts; there a new constituency was created on the very ground that the boroughs were close, and for the purpose of destroying the partial and predominating influences. Yet the districts were retained, and new conjunctions formed: that is, it was admitted, and acted on, as the foundation of the ministerial reform, that, with a new constituency, places might vote in districts, without any danger from former nominating influence.

The objection, that this point had been already settled, especially by the discussion on sir R. Peel's motion, was unfair, as well as unmeaning. The mover of the present proposition had actually voted against that motion, so little were they alike. That motion had merely decided that there should be disfranchisement, but not to what extent that disfranchisement should go, and the present motion was merely a corollary to that principle—that the disfranchisement should not be of the sweeping and general character contemplated by the bill, but that, in certain cases, there should be an union of the boroughs—a majority of 111 rejected the motion.

The only other general question discussed by the committee, before it proceeded to consider the cases of the individual boroughs, regard-

ed the rule for taking the population. In the original bill ministers had adopted the population returns of 1821. To that rule they still adhered, although a new census had been going on, and was already, if not finished, on the very eve of being completed. On the 19th of July, Mr. M'Kinnon moved, that it should be an instruction to the committee to consider the population of the boroughs in schedules A and B, as it stood in the new census, instead of that of 1821. He could conceive, he said, no sound reason why, even taking population as the test of nomination, the House should disfranchise, not the nomination boroughs which now existed, but only those which had existed ten years ago, or why, looking at the boroughs on any principle of selection, whether for disfranchisement or enfranchisement, the House should not regard them as they were at present. If the census of the present year were adopted, retaining the lines which ministers had drawn, the result would be, that six or eight boroughs would be taken out of schedule A, and transferred to schedule B; that three or four boroughs now placed in schedule B would be taken out; that one or two boroughs would be transferred from schedule B to schedule A, and that one borough, not at present mentioned in schedule B would be placed there. He was aware of the argument which was used against taking the census of 1831 as the criterion of population—namely, that it might be considered as not impartial. This argument, however, reflected but a poor compliment upon those individuals who were employed to make up the returns. But, if so much suspicion of partiality was entertained against the returning



officers, how could the House feel confident, that, when the Reform Bill came into operation, great frauds would not be practised in the registration of the 10*l*. householders? He was sure, that, if ministers opposed his motion, the only answer which they could make must be of a similar kind to that which cardinal Ximenes, when preparing to overturn the constitution of Spain, gave to a Spanish nobleman, who inquired by what means he intended to effect his object. The cardinal replied by pointing to a well-organized and disciplined body of troops; and, in like manner, the only argument which ministers could employ against the present motion would be the majority at his back.

Lord John Russell and the chancellor of the Exchequer stated, that when the reform measure was brought forward in the preceding March, the latest census which the government could make use of, was that of 1821—it was the only sure document with respect to population which they possessed. If the government had chosen to wait for a new census, they might have taken that of 1831; but such a course would only have led to an alteration of the line of disfranchisement. Much inconvenience would result from the House acting upon the census of 1831; and the only advantage which could be gained, was, to see that, while some boroughs had increased, others had decreased in population. On the other hand, it was to be considered, that the census of 1821 was taken without any knowledge that it was to form the test of disfranchisement, and might therefore be considered as an impartial document. But what would be the

result, if the census of 1831 was taken as the test? Those boroughs, where no sort of fraud or management was practised, would suffer; while those, in which management had prevailed, by sweeping a number of persons into them, would be gainers, in consequence of the statement which ministers had published that 2,000 was to be the line of disfranchisement. They believed, moreover, that the new census would not prove any of the condemned boroughs not to be insignificant and inconsiderable.

The motion was supported by Mr. G. Banks, Mr. Trevor, and Mr. Praed, who expressed his surprise that any debate should have arisen on a proposition so plain and just, or that the House should actually be called on to shut its eyes to the essential fact of what had occurred in regard to population during the last ten years. It would be inconvenient, forsooth, because it might occasion numerous changes in the bill; and was it possible to induce the House to overlook the increase of population during ten whole years, because the state of the bill would require to be altered? It was next asserted that, by taking the returns of 1831, some partial unfairness might probably be committed. But, even supposing them to be partially unfair, were they not better than those of 1821, which were universally inapplicable? Was the House, because the returns of 1831 might here and there be erroneous, to take those of 1821, which were uncertain in every single case?

The House, by a majority of 75, resolved to adhere to the returns of 1821.



## CHAP. VII.

*Continuation of the Committee on the Reform Bill—Discussion regarding Appleby—The borough of Downton—The borough of St. Germain's—The borough of Saltash—Complaints of the reformers that argument was allowed upon the Bill—Proposal of Ministers that the Bill should take the lead of all other business—Proceedings of the reformers—Motion that the boroughs in schedule B should retain both members—boroughs of Chippenham—Dorchester—Guilford—Sudbury—Motion that Greenwich be excluded from the new boroughs—Motion that Stoke upon Trent have two members—Motion of Lord Milton that the new boroughs, to which the bill gave only one member, should have two—Motion against the enfranchisement of Gateshead as separate from Newcastle—Motion that a member be given to Merthyr-Tydvil—Debate on the clause of the bill for dividing large counties—Discussion on the clause enacting that freeholders in boroughs should vote for the county—Amendment moved that tenants at will of land should have a vote for counties, and carried against Ministers.*

ON the 15th of July, the Committee entered on the consideration of the particular boroughs contained in schedule A, but proceeded no farther than the first of them, Aldeburgh, Suffolk, which it was agreed should stand part of the clause. There was no division, and no remark except what shewed that the house was not yet agreed on the principle according to which these boroughs were to be dealt with. Ministers were asked to explain what was meant by a borough, in regard to this clause, for it appeared that in some instances the population of parishes on which a borough touched was included in that of the borough, and in others not. The answer was, that the committee would apply the rule of 2000 to each particular case, and it did not appear that there was any room for any question in the

present instance. Mr. O'Connell said the simple question was, whether Aldeburgh was, or was not, a nomination borough? who doubted that fact? and who, knowing that fact, would listen to special pleading about parishes and numbers? He was not disposed to inquire minutely regarding the limits of rotten boroughs. To disfranchise a borough, it was sufficient for him to know that it was a place where the right of legislating was bought and sold. On this Sir R. Peel observed, that here was a doctrine which set them all at sea again; for, while ministers said, that population was to be the test of disfranchisement, their adherents would listen to nothing but the supposed amount of influence, independent of population.

The next borough in the list, which was taken up on the 19th,



led to more discussion. It was Appleby, which had already offered to prove that the returns of 1821, admitted to be erroneous and unsatisfactory in other instances, were erroneous in regard to it, while the house had determined that this should not be allowed to be proved, even if it were true. Lord John Russell now stated, that Appleby was a borough lying in two parishes. There was a difference, however, between a borough comprising two parishes, and one extending into two parishes, but not including the whole of both. If he was rightly informed, the borough of Appleby extended into two parishes, part being in the parish of Appleby St. Lawrence, but not comprising the whole of the parish, and another part being in the parish of St. Michael, otherwise Bondgate, an extensive parish, going seven or eight miles from the town, and about fifteen miles long. Therefore, there would be a great abuse of the rule of comprehending the parish, if they comprised two country parishes, of which the borough took in only a part. The mayor of Appleby, in a letter to the Secretary of State, said that the limits of Appleby were not quite correctly stated in the population return of 1821, because it did not state that the borough extended over some part of the parish of St. Michael, the principal part being in the parish of St. Lawrence. He added, that the boundaries had not been perambulated in the memory of any living person. In a recent letter, the mayor stated that "the borough of Appleby consisted of two parishes, Appleby St. Lawrence, and St. Michael, otherwise Bondgate; that the parish of Appleby St. Lawrence contained 1,359 inhabit-

ants; the parish of St. Michael, otherwise Bondgate, 1,264 inhabitants; that part of the borough which was in St. Lawrence contained 851 inhabitants; that part of the borough which was in St. Michael, 203; making in all 1,054." So far his lordship stated nothing but what was relevant to the question of population; but he started away from the test established by the bill, and shewed an inclination, like Mr. O'Connell, to adopt nomination as a fact that might be assumed, when he added, that Appleby was beyond all doubt a nomination borough—that its disfranchisement would injure nobody except the two patrons, who had no right to complain of injustice—and that this was not a case in which a serious doubt could long be entertained, whether Ministers were wrong in placing the borough where it was.

Mr. Croker maintained that the mode in which ministers were dealing with this borough, more especially when compared with the manner in which they treated others, sometimes taking in a parish, sometimes leaving it out, and thus swelling or diminishing the population, as it suited their pleasures, without rule and without principle, manifested not merely error and inconsistency, but positive partiality. One great advantage, he said, which would have been gained by adopting the census of 1831, would have been, that these returns separated the population of the boroughs from that of the parishes in which they were situated; it was otherwise in those of 1821, and yet, if the rule was to be affected by taking such a distinction, what was the house doing in legislating without any authentic information on the sub-



ject? Thus, in the return for Calne, in Wilts, the borough and parish were lumped together, and he now begged to ask the noble lord whether he knew the population of the borough and parish respectively? Several ministerial members called to lord J. Russell not to answer the question; but his lordship, after a pause, admitted, he had made no inquiry—But, continued Mr. Croker, he would tell the noble lord, that the truth must be known about Calne, and about every one of those boroughs that had escaped the inquiry which it had been thought proper to make about Appleby. Why so much trouble about Appleby, when Calne, regarding which information could so easily be procured, was staring them in the face unnoticed? Appleby was 200 or 300 miles from town; but Calne was only a few hours' drive, and well known to the Secretary of State for the Home Department. Either there was here a case of blind partiality or of the grossest ignorance; and it was the more extraordinary, since the noble lord had notice that there would be a question about the treatment of Calne in comparison with other places. He believed that, in the present case, the noble Lord had erred through ignorance—that he had had no idea that the parish of Bondgate was St. Michael's, and ought to be added to Appleby. He was convinced of this because, in the first paper which was the foundation of the noble lord's bill, he found it stated, not that it was in the parishes of St. Michael and St. Lawrence, but generally that Appleby had a population of 824 persons; the population return of 1821 stating it to consist of one parish, the other parish being lost

sight of in the name of Bondgate. The house had got an admission that the first return was false, an error in fact, and he doubted not that his bill originated in this error in fact. It might be convenient to look at the returns of 1811. They were classed according to towns; the returns of 1821, according to parishes. In the returns of 1811, Appleby town and the parish of St. Michael, otherwise Bondgate, were stated together; and, would the house believe it? in the returns of 1811, the population amounted to more than 2,000; so that even at that remote period, Appleby was a borough in a condition not to be disfranchised. It could not be pretended that Appleby should be dealt with on the ground of the parishes not adjoining close enough to be combined into one constituent body; for though the noble lord says that Bondgate runs some seven miles from Appleby, he admits that parishes running from fourteen to fifteen miles asunder have been included under his riding commission. Then let the committee consider the conduct of ministers with respect to Malmesbury, as contrasted with their conduct towards Appleby. In the original bill submitted to the last parliament, Malmesbury was placed in schedule A, because the population of the borough, apart from the parish at large, was but 1,300. But it was found that if the population of the parish and borough were taken together, the sum would be above the line of disfranchisement, and so in it goes into schedule B, while Appleby, with a population, on the same principle of parish and borough, still more above that line, is wholly disfranchised. Was this fair?—was it



defensible on any principle of truth or justice? Oakhampton also, was originally set down in schedule A, because its borough population was only 1,900; but was afterwards transferred to schedule B, because the population of the parish at large amounted to 2,023, that is, because, by considering it as ministers were now asked to consider the case of Appleby, they found that taking the parish and borough population together, the sum would be twenty-three above the line; therefore the great magician with his prestopass celerity transfers it to schedule B; while the borough of Appleby, with its population of 2,600, is wholly disfranchised. Even this was not all. There was another place quite parallel to Appleby in every thing but its treatment by the framers of the bill, the borough of Horsham. Horsham was permitted to retain its two members, though not entitled to them, if truth and fact only influenced ministers in their selection. And how did ministers pretend to justify this unfair treatment? Simply by the misapplication of the rule which they refuse to be applied to Appleby. By the census of 1821, Horsham—borough and parish—contained 4,507 inhabitants; but there was a notice appended to the returns of 1821, which referred to the preceding returns of 1811, and which showed that the sum of the population which ministers took for their basis was made up of three separate divisions or townships? In 1811, the number of inhabitants in the borough of Horsham was 1,714, in the north division 1,111, in the south 930; making a total, according to that census, of 3,755 souls. And how did they suppose the increase of 700 since 1811 was

accounted for in the later returns? Of course the increase would be exclusively within the walls of the borough, otherwise the ministers, who refused to annex St. Michael's parish to Appleby, would not have let it influence them in allowing Horsham to retain its right of returning two members. By no means: the increase is ascribed to the circumstance of some 800 acres of adjoining waste land having been enclosed and cultivated. But another case would, if possible, still more show the one-sided view which ministers took in their selection of boroughs for disfranchisement or preservation. Horsham belonged to a noble personage rather attached to whig politics. So did the borough of Morpeth, which was originally set down in schedule B—that is, was to lose one of its members; but ministers having since discovered that by embracing the population of the entire parish, the sum would be 4,130, did so, and thus the whig borough of Morpeth retains its two members. And what more did members on his side of the house seek with respect to Appleby, but that the population of the adjoining parish of St. Michael should be in a similar manner included? But ministers without the shadow of a reason, why or wherefore, refused, and thus Appleby with a population of 500 above the line of disfranchisement, was to be wholly deprived of the right of returning representatives. Again, there was the case of Aldborough, which having but 800 inhabitants, was originally set down in schedule A; but, for some reason or other as yet unexplained, it was since annexed to the adjoining parishes—as he asked them to act towards Appleby—and transferred



to schedule B. There was no argument to justify all these changes and selections, which did not *a fortiori* apply to the case of Appleby. Various other members enforced the same views, and asked was there or was there not a rule to be followed in including, or excluding the population of the parish in which the borough was situated, and if so, what was it?

On the part of ministers, Mr. B. Carter stated the rule to be, that, where the population of a borough and of the parish in which the borough lay, amounted to more than 2,000 or 4,000, then the entire population should be taken as the standard; but that where the parish or parishes lay altogether beyond the boundary of the borough, then the population of the borough was taken by itself; and this rule, he said, disfranchised Appleby, while it did not touch the other boroughs which had been mentioned. This was a mistake as to the facts, because the parish of St. Michael was not a parish lying "altogether beyond the boundary of the borough:" on the contrary it was admitted that the borough partly lay in it, and that part of the proper borough population were residents in that parish. Lord John Russell allowed all this, but still said, that the numbers which would raise the population above 2,000, though taken from parishes in which the borough lay, would be taken from a rural population. But so it was likewise in all the other cases in which the parish had been included. The chancellor of the Exchequer took another view. He said that ministers had admitted the rural population into the borough where only one parish was concerned, but never where there were two. It

was immediately answered, in the first place, that was a mistake in point of fact. Truro contained only 1800 inhabitants, and stood in this schedule in the first bill; but it had now been removed from the schedules altogether, because it extended into, though it did not comprehend, two particular parishes, by the addition of which, the population had been raised above 4,000. Secondly, it served no good purpose to say, even if true, that ministers had determined to join the remainder of a parish to a borough only where there is one parish, but not where there are two parishes; what was wanted was, the intelligible statement of some ground of reason, justice, or expediency, why such a distinction should be adopted. A borough lying in one parish, and containing perhaps 1,300 inhabitants, was to be allowed to borrow 700, or 800 inhabitants of the extra-burgal part of the parish, in order to its salvation; but another borough, containing perhaps 1,900 inhabitants, and lying partly in two parishes, was not to be allowed to borrow one single individual from the extra-burgal population for the purpose of avoiding utter damnation. The question was not whether ministers had so resolved,—that was plain enough—but whether any one sound consideration could be pointed out, why just and reasonable men should so resolve.

This discussion afforded a striking instance of the ignorance in which the house was legislating. Sir Robert Peel said, he believed the facts to be, that the burgal population of Appleby was 1,050, but the burgal population joined to the extra-burgal population of the parishes in which the borough lay, amounted to 2,600. Now the



question was, shall these two parishes be combined into one borough? He thought that justice would be more effectually done by combining these two parishes with, than by separating them from the borough. Let the committee consider in the first place how the jurisdiction ran in the two parishes. He understood that the corporate jurisdiction of the borough extended all over the two parishes. Mr. J. Brougham stated that on that point the right hon. baronet was misinformed. The jurisdiction certainly was not the same. Sir R. Peel said one of the evils of which the committee had a right to complain was, that it had not sufficient information on this and several similar points before it. He was given, however, to understand, that the coroner for the borough, and not the coroner for the county, took inquests in these two parishes. Mr. J. Brougham contradicted this statement also. Then, said Sir Robert, these interruptions—not unfair interruptions—just shew that ministers would have acted much better had they taken the advice tendered to them on a former occasion, and appointed a select committee to ascertain facts as to each particular borough, in order that the house might hereafter decide upon them. He scarcely knew how to legislate in such a dearth of all authentic information. Lord Maitland said, he was instructed that the jurisdiction of the mayor of Appleby extended over the whole extent of both the parishes of St. Lawrence and St. Michael, and that the licences for public-houses in the remotest parts of both always came from the mayor of Appleby. Mr. J. Brougham stated that he was otherwise informed on this point, too. Sir C. Wetherell

and Sir E. Sugden put it to the house, how it possibly could proceed to condemn in such circumstances, without evidence and without inquiry. Lord John Russell saw no necessity for evidence. The chancellor of the Exchequer said, that even if it were ascertained that the jurisdiction of the borough magistrates extended over the whole of the two parishes, the case would not be altered, because the borough itself did not extend over them: and a division sealed the disfranchisement of Appleby by a majority of 74.

The discussion on the remaining boroughs in this schedule was continued on the 20th, 21st, 22nd, and 26th of July. Not one of them was saved; only one of them was consigned to destruction without some conversation or remark respecting the grounds on which disfranchisement was proposed; but to record these conversations, which, though they sometimes contained a good deal of smart skirmishing, brought out and established no leading principle, would only be accumulating useless details. We shall confine ourselves to those cases in which the opinion of the house was taken by a division as involving a serious question on the application of the alleged principles of the bill.

On the 21st of July, the committee, in the course of the schedule, came to the borough of Downton, the population of which was admitted on all hands greatly to exceed 2,000. Accordingly, it had not been included in the first bill, and could not, with any regard to the avowed principle on which the schedule in the present bill was framed, be made a part of it. But ministers had doomed it to disfranchisement upon another



ground, which had no connection with population, the test of the bill, viz. the small number of 10% houses, which amounted in 1821 to only nine, though they had now increased to somewhat above 100. Mr. Croker moved that the borough should be transferred from schedule A to B as confessedly containing a population approaching more nearly to 4,000 than to 2,000. Ministers, he said, now spoke of the number of electoral houses, though, in introducing the bill, and, hitherto, in discussing it, population alone had uniformly been stated as the test of disfranchisement. In justice to the boroughs that were to be disfranchised, and to the electors whose rights were to be confiscated, he demanded that the severe and stringent rule, which the noble Lord had himself laid down, should be impartially acted upon. With respect to population, the case of Downton was so strong, that it might almost claim to be taken out of both schedules. In 1821 the population was 3,114. The noble lord said, that the number of electoral houses in the borough at that period was only nine. On that point he was misinformed. The number of electoral houses was then thirty-eight, which exceeded in number the electoral houses possessed by seven boroughs which were contained in schedule B. Therefore upon the noble lord's own showing, it appeared that the borough of Downton had a greater population than fourteen or fifteen of the preserved boroughs, and a greater number of electoral houses than seven preserved boroughs, and yet, for no reason that he knew of, it was proposed to disfranchise it. The noble lord admitted that, at the present mo-

ment, the borough contained 108 electoral houses. If that were the case, it ought to stand very high on the list of preserved boroughs. Out of the forty-seven boroughs contained in schedule B, thirty-three had less than 150 electoral houses each. Out of the boroughs which were to be retained, eighty-four had not 300 electoral houses each; therefore, if the bill should pass, there would exist eighty-four boroughs requiring outvoters. They would come fresh from the hands of their maker, deformed with an imperfection in their constituency. If there was to be any principle in this bill at all, if it was true, as ministers had stated an hundred times over, that population was to be the test, Downton must be removed from the schedule of total disfranchisement, and restored to the place which it had held in the first bill.

Lord John Russell and Mr. Stanley admitted distinctly, that disfranchisement, in this case, was not justified by the line of population which ministers had drawn; that to restore the borough to schedule B would not violate any principle of the bill, and that it would to them be no disappointment, if the committee should determine so to restore it. But they had placed it where it was, from the difficulty of forming a proper constituency, notwithstanding its population. The number of 10% houses at present in the borough might be taken at about 100, or very little more. It then became a question how the number of 300 houses, rented at 10% each, was to be made up. The surrounding district was composed principally of downs, and it would be necessary to proceed to a considerable distance, in order to obtain the requi-



site number of constituents. It would, indeed, be impossible to complete the number without proceeding to Fordingbridge, a town which contained a considerable number of inhabitants; but, in that case, Downton would merely have a share in the election of Fordingbridge, instead of Fordingbridge having a share in the election of Downton. It would be very difficult to make Downton a free and independent borough. Could they find a constituency in the middle of Salisbury-plain? They would have to go four miles and a half, and into another county, to add to the constituency, and then they would perhaps procure thirty or forty additional votes. It was very true, that, by the population return of 1821, the inhabitants of Downton amounted to 3,114. But the inconsiderableness of the borough might be inferred from the amount of taxes which it paid. The borough, in 1828, paid 54*l.* annually, the whole parish 116*l.* In 1830, the borough paid 72*l.*, and the whole parish 110*l.* Taking these circumstances into consideration, looking at the small number of electors, and knowing it to be avowedly a nomination borough, he had thought they had sufficient reason for placing it in schedule A.

Sir Robert Peel, and other members, who supported Mr. Croker's motion, could not see how these circumstances, or any others, could justify a departure from a principle deliberately adopted. Nomination, as a ground of disfranchisement, independent of population, was admitted not to be the principle of the bill. If it was to be applied at all, the instances of preserved boroughs, to which it would be applicable, were many, yet mi-

nisters announced no intention of applying it there. What was meant by saying that it would be necessary to go four or five miles to make up a constituency, when, in the case of Morpeth, they went fifteen miles for the same purpose? The more extensive the district, the more widely situated the electoral houses, the more independent of any patron must the voters be. Adhering to the principle of the bill, why should not the renter of a 10*l.* house upon Salisbury-plain have a right to be included in the franchise for Downton? It was useless to talk of distance, since it appeared that different places were to be appointed for the poll. Those who were favourable to the extension of the franchise would surely vote for this amendment, which would bring forward a class of voters, the 10*l.* farmers, who were never called into operation before. Though Downton was now a nomination borough, it would cease to be so, if placed in schedule B. No influence could then be exercised with respect to it, beyond that fair influence which property always must command. Much mistake appeared to be entertained with respect to the localities of the borough. The neighbourhood of Downton was populously inhabited, was as well cultivated as the open parts of Wiltshire; and in that neighbourhood a sufficient number of electors could be found, without travelling into Hampshire.

Other members declared themselves satisfied with the fact, that this was a nomination borough, and would make no inquiries about population, or the possibility of making it independent, or the application of any principle but this, that what they believed to be a nomination borough must be de-



stroyed. It was not true, said Mr. O'Connell, that no principle of the bill would be violated by preserving Downton. That principle, which consisted in annihilating nomination boroughs would be violated—altogether forgetting that the declared principle of the bill was not simply the disfranchisement of boroughs *de facto* in the power of patrons, but only the disfranchisement of boroughs under a certain line of population, as being nomination boroughs, and a change of constituency, with a partial disfranchisement, in nomination boroughs, above that line. Would any member deny, said Mr. O'Connell, that Downton belonged to the earl of Radnor? Would any man deny that he sent two members into that House? The constituency of Downton was composed of twenty thatched cabins. The people of England wanted no numerical calculations. The knowledge of the number of inhabitants in boroughs was of use only as showing that they were likely to be corrupt; but, if the House arrived at the fact of corruption by other means, where was the use of numerical calculations? He hoped that all real reformers would rally on this occasion, and not suffer the borough of Downton to escape on any pretence whatever.

Ministers themselves voted for the disfranchisement, but they were deserted by about forty of their usual supporters, and their proposition was carried only by a majority of 30 in a House of 518 members.

One acknowledged principle on which the bill proceeded was, that where a borough, containing fewer than 2,000 inhabitants, lay within, and formed part of, a parish, the extra-burgal population of which

would raise the number above that line, the whole was to be taken, and the borough excluded from the list of total disfranchisement. In consequence of this rule, or principle, the borough of St. Germain's had been placed, in the first bill, in schedule B. It was now removed to schedule A, and Mr. Ross moved (26th July), that it should be restored to its former position. This, he said, was not only not a violation of any principle of the bill, but any thing else would be a departure from those principles. It was true that the borough itself had not 2,000 inhabitants, but then it came under another principle laid down by ministers, that where the borough was included in the parish, the population of both should be included. It was admitted, that, if this plan had not been adopted, many boroughs would be disfranchised which were now allowed to send members. By the population returns of 1821, St. Germain's had a population of 2,400, and at present it was rather more. He mentioned this fact to show that the borough was not declining. In this return the population of the parish was included. In the question of population it resembled Downton, but it differed from it in these respects—that it was impossible, in the latter, in any convenient distance, to get the required number of electors, and that in the amount of assessed taxes it was much below it. Now St. Germain's was not in a poor and thinly inhabited district—it was in one of the richest parishes in Cornwall; it contained in the borough alone 100 houses, and it would be easy to make up the required number of 300 in the neighbourhood. It paid 341*l.* in assessed taxes, more



than was paid by St. Ives or Malmesbury, as much as Oakhampton, and treble the amount paid by Downton. As to the returns, all the information they contained was known to ministers last session. One of the returns, which stated that there was no house in the parish, exclusive of the borough, rated to the poor rates at 10*l.* a year, was erroneous. There were many respectable houses in the parish, exclusive of the borough, which were worth more than 10*l.*, and many others might be found in the place which would make up the required constituency. He thought there was a fair claim on the part of the borough not to be included in schedule A, and he put it to the committee as a case which did not at all affect the principle of the bill.

Ministers argued their case by again introducing a new principle, of which nothing had hitherto been heard, viz. that the borough population was small in comparison with the extra-burghal—a principle requiring this to have been fixed, of which not a word had ever been heard, viz. what is the proportion that must exist between the two to entitle them to be united? They stated that there were only thirteen houses in the town and parish assessed at 10*l.* and upwards. The population of the town and borough was under 700; the town contained only fifty acres; the whole parish exceeding 9,000 acres. If the borough was as the hon. gentleman had represented, it might not be proper to make it an exception to the rule; but they had no evidence before them which would lead them to that conclusion, and from all that had reached government on the subject, they had reason to believe that a con-

stituency could not be made out without going a distance of seven or eight miles, and, in that case, it might be said, that it would be transferring the franchise to the next town, for St. Germain's was of itself too small and insignificant to bear a part in the representation. There were only eight houses in the borough, and four in the parish, rated to the house duty at 10*l.* and upwards, and this at two-thirds of their annual value, and only fifteen houses in the borough of the annual value of 10*l.* and upwards. In such a town and neighbourhood, it would be impossible to get a constituency. The object of ministers was to disfranchise nomination boroughs as a system; and, though there might be a departure in some instances from the strict letter of the bill, ministers justified themselves by their adherence to the principle. According to the returns made by the portreeve in January, 1831, when that officer had no knowledge of the purpose for which they were wanted, it appeared that the borough of St. Germain's, and the parish in which it was situated, were not co-extensive. The borough contained forty acres, the town of St. Germain's fifty acres, and the parish, into which it was proposed to swamp the borough, contained no less than 9,029 acres; nor was the population of the place concentrated in the borough. By the population returns of 1821, which were correct, with the exception that the town and borough were considered as co-extensive, it appeared that the number of houses in the town was ninety-nine, and the number of male inhabitants 247, so that the male and female population might be taken as being under



500. But what was the population of the remaining part of the parish? The remainder of the parish, including the village of Hessenford, contained no less than 1,800 or 1,900 inhabitants. The same difference of population was apparent in the returns for the present year. According to them, the town contained 672 inhabitants, and the other part of the parish 1,914. Now, if this borough were to be thrown into the parish, what was to prevent such a principle being carried to an absurdity? According to the same rule, why should not a circle be drawn round Old Sarum, which did not contain one inhabitant, and the elective franchise distributed in the surrounding district? In truth, the House had already disposed of this case by its decision on the question of the borough of Downton.

Mr. Praed, sir Robert Peel, and Mr. Croker, maintained, on the other hand, that, if there was doubt as to facts, sense and justice demanded they should be ascertained. Ministers were making an exception from an acknowledged rule, and were bound, therefore, to shew the accuracy of the data on which they rested it. But enough was known to decide this case, because their conduct in regard to other boroughs, where every thing they now stated equally applied, shewed that the proposed exception was indefensible. The disfranchisement of this borough was said to be no departure from the principle of the bill, though a violation of its letter. If so, then no man could tell what the principle was. Even take the principle, that nomination boroughs should be destroyed, without regard to population, ministers were bound to shew that St. Germain's would

continue to be a nomination borough, even with a new constituency. This they did not say, but they said it would be difficult to obtain a new constituency. It was just here that the violation of all principle was to be found; for they created the difficulty by refusing to apply to St. Germain's the true spirit of the bill, and the rules by which they had treated other boroughs. The bill, or the makers of the bill, said, a borough within a parish shall have the benefit of the extra-burgal population, and many boroughs had thus been saved. St. Germain's claimed the same advantage, and the answer was, you must be excepted, because the borough is small, and the parish large. But when had ministers discovered or declared that the benefit of the general rule was to depend on the proportion between the burgal and extra-burgal population? Even now they did not pretend to say what that proportion ought to be. Was it then to be matter of mere caprice? or when had they discovered this other new condition, that the benefit of the rule was to depend on the number of acres covered by the borough as compared with the number of acres in the parish which it did not cover? These had never been principles of the bill; they were suggestions devised on the spur of the moment to excuse a violation of its principles. The conduct of ministers in regard to other boroughs proved this to demonstration. How had they acted with respect to the borough of Christchurch? The area of Christchurch was twenty-seven square miles, or upwards of 1,700 statute acres. The total number of 10<sup>l</sup>. houses in the borough of Christchurch was eight; and,



therefore, the surrounding district was to be included, in order to make up the requisite number of 300. Then how could ministers contend that the spirit of the bill was not to swamp small towns into country districts? If what was now proposed was according to the principles of the bill, said Mr. Croker, then Calne, which is to be saved, ought to have stood in this schedule. Among the documents on the Table, laid there as furnishing information to the House, was a paper, dated in January, 1831, which told the House and ministers, "The borough of Calne is only part of the parish in which it stands, but the parish includes 8,000 acres." He begged the committee to observe that this very same number of acres in the case of St. Germain's, was to exclude that borough from the representative system. The same paper stated the male population of Calne at 996; therefore, taking the females to be in equal number, the gross population would be under 2,000, and the borough should have been placed in schedule A. "Oh," said the framers of the bill, "that must never be; we must proceed upon some other principle. Let us put the borough and the parish together, and make 8,000 acres of it, and give it a population of 4,500 inhabitants, so that it may return two members." "But," said some friend of ministers, "if you put the parish and borough together in the case of St. Germain's, that will return two members, likewise." Ministers, however, disregarded that suggestion, trusting doubtless that some lucky accident would allow them to escape from their inconsistencies. In the case of Downton their excuse was, that the earl of Radnor met the noble

lord opposite in the library, and told him Downton ought to go into schedule A; and so, because two lords met in the library of the House of Commons, the new constitution of England was changed. Aldborough, which was preserved, was more inconsiderable in population, in the amount of taxes, and in every point, than St. Germain's. The population of disfranchised St. Germain's was 2,400, whilst the population of undisfranchised Aldborough was 2,129. The number of male inhabitants in despicable St. Germain's was 247, and the number in the flourishing and dignified borough of Aldborough was 236. The number of houses in St. Germain's was 446, and in Aldborough 408. Thus it appeared, that Aldborough was in every respect inferior to St. Germain's, and yet the former was preserved, whilst the latter was destroyed.

In the case of Downton ministers had declared, that they made no point of carrying the vote. In the case of this Tory borough they conceded nothing, but the disfranchisement of it was carried by a majority of only 48.

The only other division on this schedule took place, on the same day, on Mr. Croker's motion that Saltash should be transferred to schedule B. He did so on the ground that it was a case in which the borough and parish ought to be taken together. The borough was nearly connected with the parish of St. Stephen, in the church of which parish its inhabitants were christened, married, and buried. The population of the borough was nearly 1,500, and, with the parish, the population would be nearly 2,800. It ought, therefore, to go to schedule B. Lord John Russell agreed,



that as there was not a separate chapelry, St. Stephen's appearing to be intimately connected with Saltash, it would perhaps be the most just course to exclude the borough from schedule A. The chancellor of the Exchequer, too, admitted, that the case of Saltash was one of the weakest that had come under the cognizance of ministers. It should, however, be observed, that in all the official records, a distinction was made between the parish of St. Stephen and the borough of Saltash. The parish was spoken of as "St. Stephen's juxta Saltash." Ministers had, therefore, considered this as a case where the borough and parish were distinct and separate. Saltash, he admitted, contained no inconsiderable portion of the population, and he believed that much of the wealth connected with the neighbourhood was to be found there. Unquestionably the case was one of considerable doubt and difficulty; and whether, under all the circumstances, the borough should be left where it was, must be determined by the House. The division gave a majority of 81 for removing it from schedule A. The concessions of ministers could not alter reason or justice; yet, had they been less candid, the majority would undoubtedly have been the other way. Mr. Hunt called the vote a rank cross.

Even Old Sarum, for years, along with Gatton, the standing text of reformers, was not consigned to oblivion in silence, nor without some note of the great changes which had taken place in opinion. Amidst the laughter which accompanied the motion that it should stand part of the clause, sir Charles Forbes desired the House to bear in mind, that the noble lord who

introduced this bill had stated deliberately, in a publication composed in the retirement of his study, that he would no more think of touching Old Sarum than of touching the ground on which it stood. That noble lord had not only touched it, but annihilated it, and he begged to ask of him what he intended to do next? Another member added, that, in the same work, and not in the heat of debate, his lordship had declared, that Old Sarum ought not to be touched, except upon grounds as strong as those which had expelled king James from the throne.

While these discussions were going on, the reformers out of doors, and the reforming press, eager to possess the power which was promised to them, were lashing themselves into fury, because any discussion was allowed, and manifesting with how little moderation or virtue that power was likely to be exercised. They blamed ministers for not hurrying through the bill without a day's delay. The people, they told them, had given them a majority for the very purpose of completing a measure which the people themselves had already considered and sanctioned. No other consideration was necessary, or could be tolerated, and they would become justly suspected to an indignant people, if they permitted time to be spent in discussing questions raised by the profligate tyrants and usurpers who dared to suppose that the reform bill was a thing to be examined and discussed, or that parliament sat for the purpose of deliberation. This was the amount of the daily language of the press, and of the political unions; and ministers allowed themselves to be



so far affected by this external and unprincipled pressure, that the chancellor of the Exchequer moved, on the 21st of July, that, in future, the order of the day for going into committee on the reform bill should take precedence of all other public business whatever. He admitted that his proposition was unprecedented, and one which, in future, might be inconvenient, if followed as a precedent, but he justified it on the ground of the paramount importance of the reform bill, and the endless multiplicity of details regarding it into which the House must necessarily enter, which made it an exception from all ordinary rules. If the question were only of half the importance that it was, and yet equally interested the country, it would be wise in the House to give up the consideration of all other questions, and to attend to this question alone, until it was carried to a complete termination. The country had a right to expect this course from its representatives; for, as the country was looking with breathless anxiety to their determination, it had a right to call upon them to postpone the consideration of all questions of minor importance to the consideration of this question, which was so important to all. He did not propose this motion for the sake of creating any unnecessary haste in the discussion: on the contrary, he made it in order to give more opportunity for consideration, and to prevent the discussion from being spread over so much time as to distract the House from coming to any satisfactory conclusion. The proposition which he had to make was, to pass a general resolution that the order of the day for the committee on the reform bill do take precedence of all

public business, whether petitions, notices of motions, or orders, on each day for which it might be appointed. There were, however, certain petitions which must be an exception to this resolution—he meant those petitions which related to the reform bill. He had communicated his ideas upon this subject to the Speaker, and the Speaker had consented to take the chair every day at three o'clock, and also to sit on Saturday for the reception of petitions, as in the early part of the year. By this means time would be allowed for the reception of petitions on Saturday; and he, therefore, hoped that, on all other days, they would be able to proceed to the consideration of the reform bill by four o'clock. They would thus be able to give up to it eight hours at least every night.

Mr. C. Wynn declared that, if ministers could carry, and give effect to, this motion, which, he thanked God, they could not do—all the independence of the House, all the power of the minority to resist the majority was gone, and gone for ever. If the king's ministers, backed by a majority, were empowered to say that a particular business, which was to be discussed *de die in diem*, should always be entitled to precedence over all other business whatsoever—that no member of parliament, without their consent, should bring forward any motion—then the House must abdicate its functions as the grand inquest of the nation. One day in the week—Saturday forsooth—was to be set aside for the reception of petitions, and petitions on the reform bill were to be excepted from that rule. Now, if there should be a petition charging ministers, or any one of the ministers,



with a grave offence, and if some member should be desirous to lay it before the House, was the consent of ministers to be asked to the waiving of this resolution? If what was now proposed was really attempted, there remained to the minority only their power of moving successive amendments, in order to defeat the arrangement; and, sorry as he should be to see that alternative adopted, no other course, he confessed, appeared to present itself to members who, like the member for Aldborough, had really motions of importance in contemplation. It would certainly be exceedingly unpleasant to witness the contentious spirit and the temper of irritation in which business must necessarily thenceforward be carried on. Neither was there the least occasion for resorting to this motion, for he had not yet witnessed any attempt whatever to obtrude notices, or press on other subjects of discussion in the way of the reform bill. Had such a disposition been evinced by the opponents of that measure, it might indeed have supplied a weak excuse for the course now about to be pursued; but, as matters stood, it was perfectly unjustifiable. He, therefore, put it to his majesty's ministers, whether it would not be infinitely better rather to trust to the good sense and good feeling of the House, than to call upon them to vote for a specific regulation, of which nobody could undertake to determine how far it might be carried as a precedent hereafter.

"I am satisfied," said sir R. Peel, "that the noble lord would have found it much better to depend upon his own judgment and discretion, instead of reading newspapers, and obsequiously adopting their tyrannical suggestions. He

should have treated their proffer of advice with the same contempt and indifference with which I and others view the shameful and audacious menaces daily put forth in order to deter us from the conscientious performance of our duty. Hitherto he has wisely trusted somewhat to his own discretion, and the result has shown him that there is no disposition in the House to interfere with the reasonable progress of the reform bill, or of any other measure which forms a part of the public business of the nation. We are here assembled late in the month of July; and, if people imagine that we will consent to make a new constitution without inquiry or deliberation, I can assure them they will find themselves grievously mistaken. I will not sanction any improper or undue delay, because I think such tactics must eventually recoil on those who act upon them. But when I see that ten out of the sixteen notices of motion to be considered in the committee emanate from members who voted for the second reading, and who, it appears, think it necessary that it should undergo the fullest discussion, I do think it rather hard to impute factious motives to members on my side of the House who venture to suggest other matters no less closely connected with the details of the self-same measure. I certainly will not consent that any motion shall be unfairly interposed to prevent the adequate examination of the reform bill; but I wish that the House would agree to that amicable understanding on which they had acted last session, to the effect that public business should begin at five o'clock."

The chancellor of the Exchequer replied, that though it was



true that members had not actually interfered with the progress of the bill by interposing notices of motions, yet other discussions had always incidentally arisen, so as to prevent the house from going into the reform debate until near seven o'clock, although six o'clock had been the hour previously agreed upon, according to an arrangement which members opposite had not opposed. All he wanted was, to begin the consideration of the bill daily at an early hour, and he would therefore withdraw his motion on the understanding, that the house should go into committee on the bill daily at four o'clock, which he had changed, on the suggestion of several members, for five.

It was not to be expected, that this would satisfy the press and the associations, whom nothing would please except the absence of all consideration; but it was a striking feature in the public character of the time, although not one whose existence could occasion surprise, considering the temper in which the elections had taken place, that much of this anxiety for breathless hurry was manifested in the house itself, and was enforced even there by undisguised intimidation. The new arrangement had been acted on only for four or five nights, when a colonel Evans complained that it did not satisfy the people. There was, he said, a strong and alarming feeling excited through the country in consequence of the delays which the bill had encountered. "A conference has been held between the political unions of Birmingham, Manchester, and Glasgow, as to the steps which, according to their sense of duty, they ought to take, in case the progress of the bill were protracted in the

VOL. LXXIII.

same tardy manner;"—and, if a different mode of proceeding was not adopted, he would move to examine witnesses at the bar to point out to the house the danger arising from these delays. Mr. John Smith, too, assured the house, "the anger of the population in Scotland," at the delays thrown in the way of the bill, was such, that, if the house did not alter its course, that anger would "shortly shew itself in something stronger than words;" the House ought to meet at mid-day for the consideration of the bill. Other members spoke in the same strain, and the chancellor of the Exchequer answered them all by stating, that this very discussion, when they ought to have been in committee, was not much calculated to expedite the progress of the bill. He should be happy to accede to any arrangement which should clearly be better than that upon which they were then acting, but nothing could be more improper than to endeavour to stifle discussion. By the present arrangement they now sat from five o'clock to one o'clock in the morning. They thus sat eight hours on the bill, and he thought it impossible that by any arrangement they could sit a longer time. If the House met in the morning, as was now proposed, he was not aware that they would not lose as much time as they did at present. Throughout the whole discussion, ministers themselves, and particularly the chancellor of the Exchequer, were much more moderate and conciliatory than many of their pledged and unthinking adherents, who reckoned all those discussions unnecessary, in which they felt themselves to be utterly unqualified for taking any useful or respectable part.

[O]



On the 27th of July the committee entered on the consideration of schedule B, the boroughs contained in which were, in future, to be limited to one member, because their population did not exceed 4,000. Sir R. Peel, to raise the question of the principle on which this clause proceeded, moved that these boroughs should send two members instead of one, a proposition for which, he said, the firmest supporter of the bill, if convinced by reason, might freely give his vote. There was nothing contained in the preamble of the bill which made the disfranchisement of the boroughs enumerated in schedule B a necessary measure. The preamble declared the expediency of disfranchising the boroughs in schedule A, but not those in schedule B. The boroughs in schedule B had nothing to do with the principle of disfranchising nomination boroughs; because, if they were nomination boroughs, they ought, according to the principle of the bill, to be entirely disfranchised. The committee had already determined, that fifty-six boroughs, and 111 members, should, for the future be struck out of the constituency of England; and to shew how this disfranchisement would operate, he would divide England into two districts, marked by essentially different characters. He held in his hand a small map which had been lately published, entitled, "a map shewing the places in England and Wales sending members to parliament heretofore, with the alterations proposed to be made by the bill for amending the representation." In this map he would draw a line, not exactly across the centre of the country, but from the indenture made in the coast by

the Severn to the indenture made on the opposite coast by the Wash. This line would leave Lincolnshire to the north, and the county of Norfolk to the south. A line drawn in this direction to Bristol would effect the division to which he wished to direct the attention of the House. This line was not a fanciful one, but one which divided with tolerable accuracy the agricultural from the manufacturing districts. On the north of this line were situated the great coal-fields of England, with all the manufactures which depended on them. Taking this line for his guide, he would attempt to prove that the bill gave an immense preponderance to the northern or manufacturing district, and greatly and unduly lessened the weight and distinction of the southern district, which comprised the chief agricultural counties of England. Schedule A comprised fifty-six boroughs, returning 111 members. How were these boroughs situated with respect to the districts north and south of the line? The district north of the line lost only five boroughs, out of the fifty-six. The district to the south of the line lost fifty-one. The district to the north of the line lost ten members, and the district to the south lost 101. Schedule B, again, since the decision of the committee with respect to Saltash, might be assumed to comprise forty-one boroughs. Out of these forty-one boroughs eight were to the north of the line, and thirty-three to the south. By the combined operation of schedules A and B, the manufacturing district lost eighteen members, and the agricultural district lost 134. The constructive clauses furnished no compensation for the loss which the destructive



clauses occasioned to the agricultural division. Schedule C contained twelve new boroughs, each of which was to return two members. Every one of these new boroughs, with the exception of the metropolitan districts and of the town of Devonport, was in the northern division. It was clear that the increase of members for the metropolitan district would be an injury instead of an advantage to the agricultural interest. The bill created twenty-six new boroughs with one member each, and of these twenty-four were to the north of the line, and two to the south. He had hoped that these two would at least be of some advantage to the agricultural interest; but what was his disappointment when, on looking at the clause, he found that in these instances the privilege of representation was conferred on Cheltenham and Brighton! The result of his statement was, that the southern division of the kingdom sustained a total loss of 134 members, whilst the northern division sustained a loss of only eighteen. On the other hand, the southern district gained seven members, and the northern district thirty-three. If the House would give two members to the boroughs contained in schedule B, the agricultural interest would have a chance of possessing its due weight in the representative system. At all times it was necessary to protect the agricultural interest from the augmenting influence of the manufacturing districts. The constituency of populous places had greater power of combining than the scattered constituency of agricultural districts. The influence of the press and of clubs was much more powerful amongst the former

than amongst the latter body. He therefore earnestly entreated the House to pause, and to inquire whether they might not, consistently with the principle of the bill, suffer those forty boroughs which were included in schedule B to retain the right of sending two members to parliament. But, above all things, he would entreat and implore of the House not to innovate and destroy further than was absolutely necessary — not to be too active in the work of destruction. The very extensive destruction which was already effected, must call upon those who were most ardent in the cause of reform, to pause and ask themselves seriously, whether the system of the representation of this country was really so defective, as to call for a farther and a more sweeping destruction?

Lord John Russell contended, that the charge of having neglected the southern or western counties, or overlooked the interests of the agricultural districts, was the very last that ought to be brought against ministers. Instead of taking the course now recommended, they had rather looked to the great population of the northern counties. They found, for instance, that Lancashire contained more than a million of inhabitants, while Dorsetshire had a population of only 140,000, and Lancashire would have nineteen members while Dorsetshire would have nine. Ministers wished to give to those vast dépôts of manufacturing wealth, which during the last thirty years had been constantly increasing, that importance to which they were entitled. The individuals connected with them were in the habit of trading with every quarter of the world; they kept up the relations of this coun-



try with every portion of the globe; they were, wheresoever they went, admired for their mechanical skill, and envied for their increasing and secure prosperity. Having found their way into every part of the habitable world,—having for years maintained the character and power of this country, yet, strange to say, they had never found admittance into that house, which should have been their proper place. In proceeding as they had done, ministers felt, that the representation should not be a representation of a particular class of men, strongly addicted to a specific set of opinions. They thought that, if they adopted such a course, those so selected might give to the machine of government an impetus and a velocity not consistent with the established state of things. Therefore it was, that they stopped their career at a particular point, and had laid down a line beyond which they would not go. There were forty boroughs in this schedule which would send one member each to parliament, and there were thirty others that would still return two members. These latter did not contain any great body of constituents, but still they would send members to parliament to represent certain portions of the people, who had as fair a right to be represented as any other body. By taking this course, they would add to the stability of the representation, and obtain an equilibrium which was not to be found in any other scheme of legislation which ministers could devise. They had left to the boroughs in this schedule the right to send one member each to parliament. They had not, in doing this, acted from partial or personal views, but because they thought it right and

just to stop where they conceived that total disfranchisement was no longer necessary.

To this the opposition replied, that it was a gross paralogism to say that these boroughs ought to have only one member, because other boroughs, not yet represented, ought to have, some one, and others two. To say, that the boroughs in schedule B should have two members did not mean or imply that the boroughs in schedules C and D were to have none or fewer than the bill contemplated, and ministers had not so treated the proposition. Where then was the logic of declaiming about the unrepresented wealth and enterprise of the northern manufactures, as if the question had been whether they should be excluded from the representation? But ministers said, they had looked at the great population of these “vast dépôts.” If they had, what did they find in it to justify their giving it so tremendous a preponderance? The census shewed that the town population did not amount to more than 4,500,000 persons, whereas the rural population amounted to upwards of 7,000,000. Suppose that property was selected as the basis of this new constitution; how did that stand? The houses, according to the last return of property, averaged 15,000,000*l.* per annum, while the land reached 30,000,000*l.* per annum. Again, if they looked to contribution, they would find the same inequality. The houses in this kingdom, including mills and manufactories, according to the last report made to that House, paid 2,000,000*l.* to the poor rates, while the land paid no less than 6,800,000*l.* What, then, was the rational course for those to pursue, who were now at-



tacking the constitution with such zeal? They ought to have done that which they had neglected and refused to do—they ought to have laid before parliament some just, clear, and intelligible plan, instead of a scheme which was absurd and contradictory. Ministers called this measure an adjustment of the system of representation; but let the House see what was the nature of this adjustment. It gave about 300 members to the towns, and about 150 to the country population—that was to say, it adjusted the representation in such a manner that one body should have just half as much of it and no more, as the other body had.

Sir Robert Peel's motion was rejected by a majority of sixty-seven, and the committee entered on the consideration of the individual boroughs, which were all disposed of in the course of four days. In the case of Chippenham, an unavailing attempt was made to be allowed to prove the gross inaccuracy of the return in regard to its population. One of its members stated, and offered to prove at the bar, that, in 1821, it had contained 4,411 inhabitants, though the census of that year gave it only 3,506. By parochial returns which had been made out with a view to levying the poor rates, it could be proved that 155 houses had been entirely omitted from the return, and hence the apparent deficiency of population. Ministers resisted the admission of any evidence or the entering upon any inquiry. The chancellor of the Exchequer said, that there might have been a mistake as to the number of houses, but it did not follow, that there had been any mistake as to the population; and even if there were, how could these returns now

be corrected? The inquiry would be endless. The opposition complained that this was a direct violation of the repeated declarations of ministers, that if any borough could bring itself fairly above the line, its claims would be listened to. Here proof was offered that Chippenham did, in point of fact, contain in 1821 more than 4,000 inhabitants; and the answer made was, it may be so, but we will not allow you to prove it, and it was made on this very logical and natural presumption that, although it was admitted that a very large number of houses had been omitted, in making up the returns, yet it must be assumed that the persons living in these houses had not been omitted! The returns of 1821 contained only 576 houses, while those of even 1811 contained 668 inhabited houses. This alone afforded a reasonable presumption that some great mistake had been committed. Where the case, on the first blush of it, appeared so probable in itself, and so easily susceptible of proof, let ministers, if they would not hear evidence at the bar, at least allow this borough to stand over till inquiry should be made, since it was plain that, as matters stood, it was impossible for the House to decide, without deciding in the dark. But ministers thought "no good could possibly arise from delay," and on a division a majority of seventy in their favour determined the question. A larger majority continued in the schedule the borough of Cockermouth, which the opposition contended, deserved as well to be exempted from it, as the whig boroughs of Morpeth and Horsham. The opposition endeavoured, likewise, to save both its members for Dorchester, the county



town of Dorsetshire, on the ground that, although it fell within the strict line of population selected by ministers, it had 500 electors, and no fewer than 333 ten pound houses. Among the boroughs which were still to send two members, there were at least six, the number of 10*l*. houses in which was smaller by sixty than in Dorchester, and the latter neither was, nor ever had been, a nomination borough. Moreover Fordington was as much a part and parcel of Dorchester as any one place could possibly be of another; the united population of both would exceed 4,000, and why should not the same principle, on which Falmouth was joined to Penryn, and Walmer and Deal to Sandwich, not so intimately connected together, be applied to a case like this? It was answered that Fordington was not Dorchester, and Dorchester admittedly did not contain 4,000 inhabitants. It might not be a nomination borough, and there were other boroughs in this schedule in the same situation, but the proposed change would effectually put a stop to the system out of which nomination boroughs had arisen.

An attempt was likewise made to save Guildford, by a reform member, and on the ground that the returns were erroneous which stated its population in 1821 to be only 3161. Guildford comprehended three parishes, including which, but excluding the rural population extending two miles in the environs of the town, the population of 1821 amounted to 4212. It contained upwards of 315 ten pound houses, and almost the whole town consisted of freeholds. If the number of houses in Guildford, and which ought to have been included in the return, had been included,

the population, even according to the return, would have exceeded 4,000 and nowhere could there be found a purer constituency than in this borough. Ministers, however, would admit of no inquiry, and considered it just such a case as Dorchester, where you would have to go out of the borough to make up the 4,000, the borough population being only 3,723. It was answered, that it was just the reverse of Dorchester. In the latter, the houses to be included were not in the town; but in the present case the houses, which it was sought to include in the return, were within the town. A majority of seventy-seven decided that Guildford should lose one of its members. Sudbury, with a returned population of 3,950 shared the same fate, from the refusal to admit a suburb district forming a continuation of one of its streets, on the ground that it was not included in a local act for paving and lighting Sudbury.

The enfranchising clauses came next, by which members were to be given to places hitherto unrepresented, and, in regard to them, there was less diversity of opinion. The first set consisted of those to which two members were to be given. Among them was "Greenwich, including the parishes of Greenwich, St. Nicholas, and St. Paul, Deptford, and Woolwich." Sir R. Peel moved that Greenwich should be erased from this schedule, on the ground that, to give it two members, would only be adding to a power already too great—the representation of the metropolitan district, to which this very clause gave eight new members besides. He was unacquainted, he said, with any particular circumstances which should entitle



Greenwich, and the other places which it was proposed to unite with it, to this privilege. He was not aware of any trade which was carried on in those places which required protection. Their sole claim to representation depended on the amount of their population, which varied according to changes in the circumstances of the establishments which government maintained in those localities. The population returns of 1821 showed that the population of Deptford had decreased, whilst that of Greenwich had increased. The former circumstance was attributed to a reduction which took place in the dock-yard, and the latter to the establishment of the Naval Asylum, and an increase in the number of resident pensioners. It was an admitted blot in the representative system, that such towns as Leeds, Manchester, and Birmingham, had no share in the representation; but it could not fairly be alleged that any defect of representation existed with respect to the metropolitan district. The members returned for the city of London, the city of Westminster, and the borough of Southwark, were eight in number. The representatives of the county of Middlesex were returned under town influence, and not under the agricultural interest. According to the population returns, it appeared that there were in the county of Middlesex 9,393 families employed in agricultural pursuits, whilst there were 161,356 families employed in trade and manufactures. The whole rural population of Middlesex could not exceed 70,000, out of a total population of 1,140,000. It was evident from this statement that the members for the county must be returned under the town interest. The total

population of the county of Surrey was 398,000, of which 268,000 were engaged in trade and manufactures, so that he was justified in assuming that one member for this county was returned on the town interest. The conclusion to which these facts led him was, that the metropolitan district was at present amply represented, it having no less than eleven members in the House of Commons. It was to him a just cause of surprise, that ministers should propose to add ten members more to this number. On the grounds of population, and of the amount of assessed taxes paid by this district, ministers might be able to make out a case; but those were not the principles on which the bill proceeded. Liverpool, with a population of 200,000, was to have only two representatives. Why were not the same principles applied to that great town as were applied to the metropolitan district? The three propositions which he had thus attempted to establish were these—1st, That the metropolitan district of London, with reference to other parts of the country, was amply provided with members, as it returned no less than eleven members;—2nd, That the ancient usage of England, with respect to the representative system, gave an equal right to all places to return representatives;—and 3rd, That the same was the case with respect to this bill, as was seen in the instances of Calne and Manchester, the former continuing to return members on account of ancient right, and the latter being allowed that privilege in consequence of its great population. The one place retained its old right, the other became possessed of a new one. Now, from



the positions which he had laid down, he inferred that, unless some special case were made out for the metropolitan district, the plan, which it was proposed to pursue respecting it, ought not to be approved. Could those who proposed this alteration show, that, either with reference to population or contribution, the metropolitan district deserved this additional number of members? A case, he knew, could be made out, but it was a case against those who called for these additional members. In his opinion, ministers were about to concede this boon to Middlesex, not on account of any peculiarity in its local situation, but merely in accordance with the arbitrary line which they had laid down. In doing so, they were guilty of a departure from ancient usage, and even from the principle of the bill itself. For the various reasons he had stated, he should strenuously oppose the insertion of Greenwich in schedule C.

In regard to the new members to be given to the metropolis, the chancellor of the Exchequer said, that it was impossible to leave large districts, overflowing with population, wealth, and intelligence, unrepresented. Ministers, therefore, had to decide, whether they should give these districts new members, or join them with the parts of the metropolis that were already represented; they had believed the former to be the wiser course, and they had adopted it. London being one immense town, was, in consequence, divided into several separate boroughs, each having the right to return representatives; and therefore ministers did not wish to depart from that principle. If they joined those places named in the schedule with other metropo-

litan districts that now returned members, it would have the effect of nearly disfranchising the latter. If they added those places to Westminster, for instance, the weight and importance of that place would be considerably reduced. They could not, therefore, in common fairness or justice, add those immense places enumerated in the schedule to other districts which already returned members. Therefore the course which they deemed it most advisable to take was, to consider them as separate boroughs; just as the city of Westminster and the borough of Southwark were, at the present time, distinguished as separate boroughs. That was the course which appeared to ministers to be most consistent with reason, and with the present state of the representation. Now, when they were giving representatives to different places, they could not, when they saw such population and wealth as Greenwich and its neighbourhood boasted, avoid taking its claims into consideration, and they decided, when they had done so, on placing it in this clause. It was said, that the population of Greenwich and Deptford was, in a great degree, composed of persons employed by government. There were undoubtedly persons there who were employed by government; but the amount was such, that it could not have any very material weight in influencing the return of a member to serve in parliament. The observation, however, was rather a strange one to come from the other side of the House, since the gentlemen seated there had all along declared that ministers were destroying the just and necessary influence of the Crown. If they supposed that Greenwich would hereafter be a



mere nomination borough, he could only say that it would be a most enormous one, as its population was not less than 40,000. So far as government was concerned, some influence might be retained, but that influence would not have the effect of placing in the hands of government any undue or unfair degree of power.

Mr. Wynn, Mr. Baring, Mr. Croker, and Sir C. Wetherell enforced the views which had been taken by Sir R. Peel, contending, that the proposition was not only a most inexpedient addition to the metropolitan representation, but that, in itself, it set all sense and principle at defiance, proceeding on the mere basis of population, and of lumping together, in order to make up that population, totally distinct masses, an operation against which ministers had set their faces in every instance where their antagonists had proposed it. It was easy to foretel, from what happened to Alderman Thompson in London, and to Sir R. Wilson in Southwark, for voting, not against the bill, but against ministers, how such an influence would be exercised. If a clamour arose in Westminster, it was not too much to say that it was sure to spread to London, Southwark, Greenwich, Deptford, and all these new metropolitan boroughs, and their representatives would be compelled to obey it, instead of exercising their own reason and judgment. The addition of ten members to the metropolitan union of eleven, which the district of the capital already enjoyed, would constitute an union of twenty-one members, an innovation in the constitutional system of representation which had never existed, and ought not to exist. Sir C. Wetherell did not mean to say, that such an union as this,

within the walls of parliament, would be as dangerous as the Birmingham Political Union, with which a minister of state had thought it fitting and proper to correspond; but it did appear to him, that such a number of gentlemen thus confederated together would be a novel thing in the constitution of that House; and that such a novelty would be productive of mischief to an extent which he should not at present predicate. They had already seen how the city of London, which would form a portion of that metropolitan union to which he alluded, had thought proper to erect itself into a judge of their proceedings, and to interfere in a most unconstitutional manner with the privileges of parliament. To be sure, as the worthy alderman had said, the Livery of London had not as yet pronounced their judgment on that House—they had not as yet *fiat* their decree—they had not as yet thought proper to determine, in regard to a matter which was still under the consideration of parliament, and in regard to proceedings which were only *in transitu*, that the House of Commons must, *nolens volens*, pass the bill in the shape that would please them—they had not as yet come to that redoubtable civic determination; but their resolution was only suspended, and, like the sword of Damocles, it was ready to fall upon their devoted heads at the given signal from those city sages.\* He referred to such proceedings merely

---

\* This had reference to a meeting which had been held by some of the livery of London, for the purpose of taking measures to compel a more rapid progress of the bill. The meeting had adjourned, however, without adopting any resolution; but the press took care to tell ministers and the House, that it was still hanging over them *in terrorem*.



as an illustration of what might be expected from that metropolitan union which this bill went to establish. Again, if population was to be the principle by which they were to be guided, why had that principle been abandoned in so many glaring instances in schedule B? Why had they partly disfranchised Guildford by intersecting and transecting houses, so as to reduce its population below the mark, while, in order to bring Greenwich up to that point of population, which would entitle it to two members, they had added to it several of the neighbouring places, such as Deptford and Woolwich? Would the noble lord opposite condescend to give a satisfactory answer to that question? Or, when the population of Greenwich was not sufficient, why were other places added to it in order to make it sufficient to entitle it to return two members to parliament, while from several boroughs, with a larger population, one of their members had been taken? Was not that a most notorious abandonment of the principle of the bill? Why had Chelsea been left out of the list? No reason had been assigned why unrepresented Chelsea should have been omitted. The only reason which he could give for the omission, if he were asked for one, was, that Greenwich was below new London bridge, and that Chelsea was above; and as the one place contained a naval, and the other a military asylum, the only distinction that could be made out between them was the distinction between a red coat and a blue coat. Why had Tooting been omitted in this list of fortunate places? why omit Battersea, renowned in story? why omit Fulham? why omit picturesque Petersham? why leave

out Rotherhithe? and, above all, why omit thrice-celebrated Garrett—Garrett, with regard to which, at least, no difficulty could be started on the score of a returning officer; for, as the hon. members were probably aware, a mayor was elected there every year? Why had all those places been omitted in the distribution of favours? To give the preference to Greenwich, appeared to him a most arbitrary and indefensible selection. It had been said that Greenwich had formerly returned members to parliament; but was that any reason that they should take one of its members from Guildford, which had always returned two members to Parliament, and that they should give two members to Greenwich, after having accumulated two or three parishes together, in order to furnish forth a population sufficient to entitle it to that privilege? Was this the way in which such important matters were to be dealt with? What answer could they give to the people of England, if they should ask them why they had dealt in such an inconsiderate manner with privileges and rights which had been established for centuries? They might depend upon it that the time would come, when the people of this country would look to see whether this measure had been founded, not only on the principles of justice, but upon the principles of common sense. For his part, he could see no particular merit in Greenwich to entitle it to the privilege of returning members of parliament. Probably it was intended, that the next time the Admiralty barge went down to Greenwich, it should take down two members of parliament there; and a very precious cargo they would be, indeed. No



one principle, parliamentary, moral, or meritorious, had been assigned why two members should be granted to Greenwich.

On the division, Greenwich was allowed to keep its place in the schedule by a majority of 107.

The want of any fixed and steady principle was still more apparent on the occasion of Mr. Littleton moving that Stoke-upon-Trent, which stood in the list of new boroughs which were to receive one member, should be transferred to the schedule now under discussion, and receive two. He stated, that it consisted of a cluster of four towns, containing a population of 53,000 persons. The inhabitants were principally employed in the manufacture of earthenware and china; and from their numbers, the extensive and important nature of their trade, and the capital it employed, they were fully entitled to have two representatives. It not only contained a much larger population than the boroughs in schedule B, but much larger than most of those in this very schedule C. This schedule contained towns having a population of 43,000 or 44,000, and here was one with 53,000, the flourishing seat of a great manufacture, one of the "vast dépôts" that had been spoken of, which was to be degraded to an inferior rank. Ministers answered, that, after the inquiries they had made, they thought one member quite enough for Stoke-upon-Trent. The population was, no doubt, very great; they did not think it, however, a case of town representation, but of an unconnected district, though, in appearance, it might resemble a large town. Besides, the county in which it was situated, Staffordshire, had already more than its

due proportion of members; and, if this motion were carried, two members must be given to several places in Lincolnshire and Yorkshire, which now had only one. Staffordshire, with a population of only 340,000 persons, had already received six new members, and would return altogether fifteen or sixteen representatives, while Lancashire, with a population of 1,221,000, had only fourteen. The question was to be considered in its relation to the general interests of the country, and not in reference to any interests purely local. If the motion were carried, it would create great jealousies in other places, and so far injure the bill. The motion was lost by a majority of 101.

A still larger majority supported the ministry in resisting a motion made by one of their own adherents in regard to schedule D, containing new boroughs which were to receive only one member. Lord Milton moved that they should have two. It appeared to his lordship, that, by adopting the principle of having one member only, they were departing from the ancient practice of the constitution, whereas, in his opinion, they ought to base themselves, as much as possible, on ancient foundations. Wherever representation existed, it seemed to have been the rule that it should be confided to two representatives. There were, doubtless, some exceptions; but these were exceptions merely. Where there were two members to be elected, the system of compromise led to the avoidance of contests, and to a more accurate representation of the people in parliament; for it was not to be denied, that, for an accurate representation of the people in parliament, the mi-



nority out of doors should find a minority in that House. Suppose there were 100 electors for a borough, and fifty-one voted on one side, and forty-nine on the other, if there was but one member, a majority of two would engross the representation, and the borough would not be fairly represented in parliament. The necessary result of this system would be, that, in periods of popular excitement, the minority might be entirely excluded from the walls of that House, into which it was highly desirable that it should find a way. He did not view schedule A with peculiar favour, though he voted for it as the means of removing the corrupt parts of the representation; but he would ask the House, he would ask his hon. friends who sat on the benches beside him, whether, if they adopted schedule D in its present state, in the remodelling of the constitution they were now making, the arrangement could by possibility be final? There would be perpetual claims from populous and wealthy places having one member, which would consider themselves equally entitled with other places to have two. It was impossible it could be final, unless they departed from the principle of schedule D; and he was prepared to give to each of the towns an additional member. He was a friend to the bill; he would support it *totis viribus*, and had not the slightest wish to distract its supporters. But this subject had pressed greatly on his mind, and he did not see that the principle of his hon. friends, which professed to be founded on population, was adhered to in this schedule. The principle of the schedule was a principle mischievous in its effects on the

constitution, and which, when its character was calmly considered by the constituency of the country, would lead to considerations of an almost painful nature. He had lately had an interview with persons from one of these towns, including tories, reformers, and anti-reformers, who concurred in stating that they would rather have no representative at all than one.

Sir Francis Burdett, on the other hand, considered single representation, if attainable consistently with the interests of the people, to be more convenient and advantageous for all practical purposes, and, for his own part, he would rather see the number of representatives diminished than increased. He did not believe that double representation would be attended with the benefits which were anticipated; and, at all events, he thought it would be better for the friends of reform to forego their own wishes, however reasonable, with respect to mere matters of detail, than endanger, in any degree, the success of the great measure before them. The chancellor of the Exchequer admitted, that the exclusion of the minority from a share in the representation would be unfair and unconstitutional. He admitted, likewise, as a general proposition, that two members were better than one; but the question was, in this case, would the evils that had been predicted, arise from having one member instead of two in those twenty-six boroughs? The largest number of places would still be represented by two, and in that way the minority in the kingdom would be represented. If, too, the House considered the sort of agreement that had been made as to the principle of the bill, he thought it



would be considered as a breach of faith to the agriculturists to add twenty-six to the commercial towns. Lord Milton's motion was lost by a majority of 128.

Among those boroughs on which one member was to be bestowed, was Gateshead, in the county of Durham. The proposal for allowing it to remain in the schedule was attacked by the opposition as the worst instance that had yet occurred of all want of consistent principle, and Mr. Croker moved, that Gateshead should be omitted. Gateshead, he said, was merely the southern suburb of Newcastle, which already possessed two members. To these it was entitled, as it contained 35,000 inhabitants, but he could imagine no reason why this suburb should be allowed to send an additional member. The latter was not distinguished from the former by any difference in the pursuits of the population, and, if they were joined, the united population of both would not equal that of Bolton, which was to return only one member. There were already three newly-created boroughs in this very quarter—namely, Sunderland, which was about ten miles from Gateshead; South Shields, which was at a still smaller distance; and Tynemouth, which was even nearer. So that here, within the circuit of ten miles of Gateshead, three additional boroughs had been created, two of them so small, that they had attracted the notice of one of the most zealous supporters of the bill. With respect to Sunderland, how had ministers proceeded? They added to that town Bishop Wearmouth and Monk Wearmouth to raise the population to 33,000, and to that population two members were given, while, in three different instances,

representatives were refused to places in Lancashire, which contained more than 40,000 inhabitants. On what principle did ministers refuse to give representatives to these gigantic places, while they were obliged to add three places together to procure a population of 33,000 in Durham? He really began to doubt his understanding, when he found the good cases, for such he conceived them to be, which he brought forward, fail of producing any effect. But he and his friends had the consolation of knowing that they were defeated by majorities, and not by reasoning. South Shields contained only 8,885 souls: of course a representative could not be given to that number. But was there no hamlet, no chapelry adjoining, which might be added to South Shields? This latter place might have been thrown into Sunderland, or into Gateshead; but no: ministers found there was the chapelry of Westoe, containing 7,600 inhabitants, which they joined to South Shields, thus making the population amount to 16,000. Now, he would ask, had that place a right to a separate representation, when it was so near Sunderland and Gateshead, and so intimately connected with another borough which they were about to create? With respect to the real population of the district, it would stand thus—Tynemouth, 9,000, North Shields, 8,205, and South Shields, 8,885, making altogether a population of 27,000 for the three places. Now, he could not conceive, if they were joined, that a population of 27,000 persons would have any right to be dissatisfied with two representatives, when a population of 47,000 had only one. Ministers did not confine themselves strictly



to the towns of North Shields, South Shields, or Tynemouth, but to bolster up the account, they took in the parishes. If, however, Clitheroe and other parishes were rejected in making up the population of certain boroughs, he could not see upon what fair principle the parish of Tynemouth should be included.

Ministers, and other members who spoke on the same side, denied that Gateshead ought to be treated as a suburb of Newcastle, for it was separated from it by the Tyne and a bridge, and lay in a different county, the river being there the boundary between the counties of Durham and Northumberland. To join it to Newcastle would be unfair towards the latter; it contained in itself a population of 15,000 or 16,000 inhabitants, and was well entitled to a member. Ministers, moreover, had not thought it right to tie themselves strictly to any particular rule in the enfranchising clauses. Certainly, they had kept population in view, but there were other points of which they had not thought it right to lose sight. One of these points was, how far different interests were, or ought to be, represented; and they had satisfied themselves that the shipping interest was not largely represented. It was for that reason that they had given members to Sunderland, including Bishop-Wearmouth and Monk-Wearmouth, to South Shields and to Tynemouth, and it was with a view to the proper representation of the same interest, that they now proposed giving a member to Gateshead.

The opposition replied, that this pretended attachment to the shipping interest would not explain

the contradiction between what ministers were now doing, and what they had done in other cases. Thus, Kingston upon Hull had 32,000, and near it was the borough of Sculcoates with 11,000. Yet ministers, amid all this regard to the shipping interest, placed Kingston in another schedule, and joined Sculcoates to it. Assuredly Kingston upon Hull was as important a town as Gateshead; yet it was thrown in along with Sculcoates, while ministers now refused to adopt the same course in regard to Newcastle and Gateshead. Even the shallow pretext for making the latter a separate borough, at the very doors of Newcastle, viz. that particular interests must be duly represented, only brought out more clearly the glaring partiality with which ministers were acting. The town and district of Merthyr Tydvill was the chief seat of the iron manufacture of the kingdom. By this bill Glamorganshire was to return four members, the county of Monmouth three, and that of Brecknock two; so that those three counties would have nine members. Now, when they were told that particular interests ought to be sufficiently represented, that new bodies of electors ought to be created for that purpose, and that even Gateshead, at one end of a bridge, should have a member, while Newcastle, at the other end of it, had two, how would the iron interest of South Wales be represented under this bill? Merthyr Tydvill contained, in 1821, 17,000 or 18,000 inhabitants, a greater number than Gateshead, and its immediate suburbs contained upwards of 2,000 more. The population was now greatly increased. It was the seat of a great and most important manufacture; and yet



it was refused even a single member, but was sent, as a paltry adjunct, to a sea-port, twenty miles distant, which had previously returned representatives. On what principle of common sense or justice, or even of the bill, could a member be given to Gateshead, and refused to Merthyr Tydvill? It was a case either of gross partiality, or of gross ignorance, obstinately persisted in, from a predetermination that, cost what it might, Gateshead must have a member, and supported by a majority with which it was in vain to reason. "When men," said sir C. Wetherell, "are congregated together in large numbers, they are usually bold; but such parliamentary and ministerial audacity, such effrontery, such appalling boldness, had never perhaps been witnessed until now." Sir R. Peel said, that he knew well that the members on his side of the House were a minority, but they were not, therefore, to be insulted with mock argument. There was not a borough in the united kingdom which might not be enfranchised by the *fiat* of certain commissioners, at the direction of his majesty's ministers' quarter-master-general. "I know that I am in a minority; but if I stand alone upon this point, I will still record, in a more emphatic manner than I could by speech, my protest against the conduct of his majesty's ministers, in giving an additional member to Newcastle, which has but a population of 46,000 at most, whilst they leave Chelsea and other popular places unrepresented. If I am alone, I will say 'No,' and sit and record my opinion on this side of the House."

In the course of the discussion it was very strongly urged

that inequalities, to give them no harsher name, like those referred to, put an end to all idea of the measure being a final one. The House would necessarily be beset with applications from boroughs which could not but feel that they had been harshly and unjustly dealt with in the distribution of the spoil, and it would puzzle any man who supported the present bill to find a reasonable answer to them. But lord John Russell declared, that ministers never pretended the present measure of reform would be final; for it would not be final, unless it were found to work for the benefit of the people, which he certainly expected it would. Now ministers had always declared, not only that they believed the measure would be a final one, but that they had exceeded their original intentions for the very purpose of anticipating ulterior demands; and then the question was, whether they were not making their arrangements so partially and unequally as necessarily to produce those very ulterior demands which they professed it was their object to avoid. Mr. Hunt, however, congratulated ministers on the new view of the bill which had thus opened to them, and on his lordship's frank avowal of it; and he would cheerfully vote with government, convinced that, in a very short time, members must be given to Chelsea, and other places, on the same principles. On the division, ministers had a majority of 104.

In another part of the same schedule, Whitehaven, with a population of 17,000, considerably greater than Gateshead, was not allowed a whole member, but was joined to Workington, a place eight miles off, and separated from it by an intervening



parish, which was not to be included. Lord Althorp said, in justification of this proceeding, that though the principle, on which ministers went, in bestowing the franchise, was, not to interfere with the legitimate influence of property, yet, in their opinion, there was too much of the influence of property at Whitehaven in the hands of one individual, and they had wished to neutralize it, and their majority thought they were quite right.

The case of Merthyr Tydvill, which had stood in such strong contrast to that of Gateshead, was again brought forward on the motion that "Llandaff, Cowbridge, Merthyr Tydvill, Aberdare, and Llanfrissant, sharing with Cardiff, in Glamorganshire, stand part of the bill." Colonel Wood moved an amendment, which was to have the effect of giving Merthyr Tydvill a member of its own, and was supported by lord J. Stuart, sir H. Hardinge, sir George Murray, and Mr. Croker. Merthyr Tydvill, they stated, along with the hamlet, which was separated only by a brook, contained, according to the census of 1821, a population of 19,021 souls, and it had not less than 680 houses letting at 10*l.* a year and upwards. Ministers had given representatives to twelve towns, not one of which possessed so large a population. Glamorganshire had received an additional county member, but still that county would not be adequately represented in the ratio of its population; and, by this clause, the inhabitants of Merthyr Tydvill would be deprived of the right of voting for the county. Merthyr Tydvill, besides, was not less than twenty-five miles from the town to which it was to

be annexed, and, what aggravated that distance, an almost impassable barrier of mountains intervened between the two places. By bestowing upon Merthyr Tydvill a direct voice in the legislature, while Cardiff was permitted to retain its member, the iron interest of Glamorgan would receive that share of representation to which it was entitled, and which Staffordshire, the other great iron manufacturing county, was so eminently to enjoy under the bill. Cardiff, too, contained of itself 360 houses of 10*l.*, which, with about 100 more, in the immediate neighbourhood, which might be conveniently annexed to it, entitled it to retain its present member. How could ministers possibly justify uniting this town with another twenty-five miles distant, when Gateshead, a much smaller town, within a gun-shot of Newcastle, was to have a separate member. It would be a case of great partiality and injustice. Lord Althorp said, he was willing to admit the principle, that a place so populous and important, with respect to manufactures as Merthyr Tydvill, should have a direct voice in the legislature; but he contended that it would be enabled by the bill to exercise that virtual influence in the election of the additional county member which Glamorganshire was to receive under its provisions. Besides, to invest Merthyr Tydvill with the right involved in the present motion would be to destroy that uniformity and fair equality of footing on which the bill placed all the counties without distinction. The majority, which rejected the amendment, was 41. -

By the 10th of August, the clauses regarding the boroughs had been disposed of, excepting



that which regarded the returning officers of the newly-created boroughs. That clause was withdrawn, in consequence of its being pointed out that, unless amended, it would not answer the purpose. Next came the counties. The clause giving six members to Yorkshire, viz. two to each riding, to be elected as if each riding were a county, was agreed to.

On the clause for dividing certain counties to which additional members were given by the bill, and intrusting the process of division to certain commissioners, a great diversity of opinion prevailed, and the two parties became intermixed with each other. Ministers stated, that the general principle to be followed by the commissioners in dividing the counties would be, to divide them so as that the number of inhabitants and of square miles in each division should be as nearly equal as possible; although, in many cases, divisions had already been so firmly established by custom, as to render it inexpedient to press the rule very strictly—to the division, for instance, of a hundred. The electoral body in each half of the counties to be divided would still be taken out of a very large population. The least populous of the counties which were to be thus treated was Cumberland, and yet the half of its inhabitants would be 78,000. On the other hand, the division would render elections much less expensive both to the candidates and to the electors. Under the present system, the electors were frequently compelled to choose, not the best or the wisest, but him who had the longest purse. The division, moreover, would allow of a more frequent intercourse between the member

and his constituents, and the latter would vote much more conscientiously, when they had to choose only two representatives instead of four.

The most thorough-going supporters of the bill opposed this scheme of division, and moved an amendment, for the purpose of getting rid of it, both on the ground that no commissioners ought to be intrusted with the power of division, and that the scheme itself was inconsistent with the true principles of the bill. The House had been disfranchising largely, for the purpose of putting down the nomination boroughs; but, by the present clause, they would convert the county districts into nomination divisions, completely under the influence of the rich landholder. So paramount would be this influence, that the ballot would be indispensable as a protection to the less wealthy freeholders; and it would be better to retain a certain number of the close boroughs, than to create close county districts. This clause would neutralize the influence which the middle and industrious classes ought to possess in county elections, and would defeat the great object of the bill, which professed to give a full, fair, and free representation to the people. Those who had voted against the disfranchisement of the rotten boroughs would be consistent in supporting the present proposition; but the people of England would be deceived, and the bill would be a mockery. Others, again, of the adherents of ministers, while they expressed their disapprobation of the clause considered in itself, expressed likewise their determination to support it as part of a whole which it was most desirable to see carried through, and which the people had



sanctioned, knowing that his was a part of it.

Lord Althorp, although he would not say that, if the amendment were carried, the bill would be lost, was determined to give it all the opposition in his power, because it would materially affect a leading feature in what had been sanctioned by the country, and the reform-majority would not be acting up to their duty if they supported it. He had yet heard no reason for believing the proposition, that the county districts would become like so many close boroughs in the hands of rich landed proprietors. No doubt the influence of property would tell in the proposed divisions, particularly so far as it was in the hands of some one or two large landholders—that is, these individuals would have a much greater chance, indeed certainty, of being returned for the divisions in which their property lay, than they could have of being returned for the whole county at large; but he was sure that that influence could not be so preponderating as to warrant the apprehension of its being abused, and that it would be neutralized by the other divisions into which the county would be parcelled. The arrangement, besides, he was pretty certain, would preclude those partial compromises which took place between the large proprietors and the independent interest in the larger counties. At present it was too much the case that half was returned by the individual holding the largest property in the county, and the other by the independent voters. But the objection, that the clause would tend to increase the aristocratic influence in the representation of counties, was, in the

eyes of the framers of the bill, no objection at all. On the contrary, while they were adding to the democratic share of the representation, by extending the franchise generally, and adding to the members of the large towns, they felt the necessity of preserving the balance of the aristocratic share, by increasing the influence of the great landed proprietors in the counties. In saying this, he did not mean that it was an object with ministers that the great landed proprietors' influence should entirely prevail in the proposed divisions, for he was convinced that some degree of popularity would be necessary to the candidate. All he meant was, that it was expedient that the aristocracy should preserve their due influence in the representation of that House. The clause would effect this by, in a great degree, confining the representation of the county divisions to the gentlemen of property resident in them, and therefore best acquainted with their wants and interests. He considered it an evil of the present system, that mere popularity should be the means of returning members for counties, oftentimes, too, strangers, to the exclusion of gentlemen of retiring habits holding large property in the county, and well qualified to represent its interests; and he knew not how that evil could be entirely got rid of, so long as the freeholders of a wide surface of country were distracted in their choice of the candidates proposed by the districts best acquainted with their respective merits—a distraction that almost inevitably ended in their choosing some popular individual, whose chief merit was, that his name was best known to all. The result of the



amendment would be, in counties returning, say, four members, that at least three of them would be persons of this popular description, while the fourth would only come in on a kind of compromise.

Mr. D. Gilbert, Mr. Goulburn, and sir R. Peel, spoke in favour of the ministerial proposition. The latter said that, looking at it, without reference to the bill, he could not approve of it, because he was sorry to see the unity of anciently connected places destroyed. But, assuming that the bill was to pass into a law, containing the schedules of total and partial disfranchisement, he had to consider how he could best create a countervailing influence which might consist with such a measure; and he thought there were solid arguments for dividing the counties, as the means of preserving the wrecks of aristocratical influence. He was glad to hear that it was not intended entirely to destroy aristocratical representation; and he thought that the small remains of that representation might be better maintained by dividing the counties, than by continuing them as they were at present. Those who thought the bill did not go far enough, might very consistently be hostile to such a plan; but he avowed that his reason for supporting it was because he agreed with the noble lord, that the popular influence was greatly increased by this bill, and he thought that the division of the counties would give a kind of counterpoise. He regretted much, however, that the important work of division should be intrusted to commissioners, or to any authority other than that of the House. They had details enough before them. Why could not a committee of the House con-

sider and report the facts, and the House make the final decision? He saw no reason why the House was not perfectly competent to decide on this point; and, if it was so, on what constitutional grounds was the important function devolved on another authority, without appeal to that House, of deciding what should be the future representation of England? Much difficulty arose from the mode in which England was to be divided, which would throw considerable discretion into the hands of the commissioners; and it was extraordinary, that, after this House had struggled so hard against the interference of another branch of the legislature with their elections, they should devolve so great a power of interference on gentlemen of whom the House could know nothing.

Sir C. Wetherell, again, and sir E. Sugden, separated from sir R. Peel, and opposed the clause, principally on a ground, in which sir Robert himself concurred—the committing the division of the counties to commissioners. Ministers, said the former, had proposed, in their first bill, to commit this power to certain privy councillors; but, as that proposition was too monstrous and gross to be entertained, they now intrusted it to a commission of their own appointment, whose acts were to be irresponsible and without appeal. He objected to this arrangement, because he did not know but that the commissioners would be guilty of gross partiality, corruption, and all sorts of blunders and mistakes. His objection to the proposition was insuperable, and he could not obtain the advantage, if advantage it was, of balancing the democratic portion



of the bill, by surrendering the power of cutting up the counties of England to an irresponsible commission, who were to act, in the execution of their duty, according to their own fancy; for the bill laid down to them no principle or rule of dividing the counties, whether by equality of population, property, space, or payment of taxes. Ministers, said sir E. Sugden, had legislated all through from the wrong end—instead of beginning with facts and details, they were going to end with them. Would it not be better that the commissioners should institute a full inquiry into the districts and divisions which it might be expedient to adopt, leaving it to the House ultimately to pronounce a final opinion on the correctness of the grounds for the proposed divisions? The House should be put in possession of each particular case, and should judge of each case, and not decide in the gross. No expense or trouble ought to have been spared in collecting facts with respect to each county, before ministers required the vote of the committee. If the borough and town population were abstracted, several counties, such for instance as Durham, would be left with little or no constituency at all. If the towns were not taken out of the counties, they would often dominate the county completely. He would maintain that, in this respect, the measure was more fraught with evil than any other clause of the bill. They should recollect that, by their clauses enfranchising certain towns and boroughs, in the arrangement of which the householders of the adjoining districts were included, for the purpose of insuring an extended constituency, the county

constituency would be by so much diminished; therefore, in proposing to invest districts, instead of the county at large, with the right of representation, they were, in point of fact, legislating on a considerably lessened constituency.

The original clause was carried by a majority of 119. Another clause, which directed the manner in which the county of Lincoln should be divided, was carried without a division, although strongly opposed on the same ground—that it would now become two nomination boroughs.

In consequence, however, of the objections urged against the powers intended to be granted to these commissioners, who were to define the new boroughs, as well as to divide the counties, ministers, during the progress of the bill, altered it so far, as to provide that the report of the commissioners, which was to be made within three months after their appointment, should be laid before both Houses of Parliament for their approbation. It would be extremely difficult, they said, to frame any declaratory clause regulating the mode in which they should proceed, consistently with the discretion which necessarily must be left to them, and this provision rendered such instructions less imperative. Ministers resisted, likewise, a suggestion which was actually made by a supporter of the bill, that the commissioners should have power to separate from any borough, places in which they might think an undue local influence predominated.

By the 15th clause of the bill it was enacted, that freeholders in cities and towns forming counties of themselves, should vote, not for the town or city, but for the county in which it was situated. This pro-



position, too, was resisted, both by many supporters of the bill, and the opposition. Among the former, colonel Davies contended, that unless this clause were rejected, and many other amendments introduced, the bill, notwithstanding all the good which it contained, would be comparatively useless. This clause would produce two mischiefs: on the one hand it would, in many instances, prevent the formation of so large a borough constituency as would be desirable, and on the other, it would give boroughs too great an influence in elections for counties. The counties were to be divided, and where the freehold borough constituency was very large, that constituency must have a powerful effect in deciding county elections. In Birmingham, for instance, there were nearly 2,000 freeholders; and it was clear that Birmingham would thus return, at least, one of the county members, in addition to its own two members. Of the nineteen towns and cities, it was stated by sir R. Peel, which were counties within themselves, the freeholders of ten of them had no right of voting either for the county or the city, or for what might be called the parent county; in four of them, the freeholders had a right to vote for the parent county; and in the remaining five, they had a right to vote for the city, in conjunction with the burgesses. Now, although these anomalies existed in the rights of freeholders in corporate towns, yet he did think, when the House was overturning the ancient fabric of representation, and constructing a new one, it would be more convenient, and more analogous to the constitution, to give to the freeholders of such places the right of voting for the

city, rather than for the county. It appeared to him most absurd to send forty-shilling freeholders, of the lowest scale, thirty or forty miles to vote at the election for the parent county. Such freeholders should be allowed to vote at elections for the city in conjunction with the householders, and the freemen who were allowed to vote under the bill; and he would not admit into such constituencies any one who had a vote for a different election. He was sure that great abuses would result from the present arrangement. If a man attached a piece of ground, ever so small, to his warehouse,—a garden, for instance,—he would thus acquire a right to vote for the county. This facility of creating a double right of voting was pregnant with abuse, and he had no doubt that Birmingham and Coventry would find means to return the county members for Warwickshire, as well as their own members.

Ministers defended the clause on the ground, that they did not think the consequences which had been referred to would follow from it, while they held that, to allow such freeholders to vote for their boroughs, would be an arrangement most dangerous to the independence of the constituency. Such an arrangement would enable any individual who possessed large freehold property in a borough to convert it into a nomination borough. There might be boroughs with not more than 300 votes; and if a man had freehold property to the amount of only 300*l.* a year, he could obtain a command over 150 forty-shilling freehold votes, and carry every election as he chose. There were places in which the multiplication of freeholds had become a great evil, as in Notting-



ham; it would be remedied by this clause, because the object for which they were created in towns would no longer exist. The danger of freeholders abusing the franchise would be much lessened by sending them to the larger constituency in the county, instead of retaining them in the smaller constituency of the towns; and the mere fact that a freeholder resided within the jurisdiction of a city or borough was not in itself any good reason why he should vote for it and not for the county. The clause was retained by a majority of 40.

When the committee reached the clause which gave a right of voting for counties to leaseholders for a certain period, and a defined rent, the marquis of Chandos moved an amendment, that the same right should belong to all occupiers of land paying a rent of not less than 50*l.*, although without any specific tenure of his land, in other words that tenants at will, paying 50*l.* a year should have votes. There was no reason, he said, why, when they were framing a new constitution, the interests of the farmer should be disregarded; and still less could reason or justice allow, that while a tenant at will of a house paying much less rent was to vote for a borough, a tenant at will of a farm paying 50*l.* should not vote for a county. Many farmers in the country held large tracts of land without any lease; and if the amendment was rejected, the clause would exclude not only men who held lands at a rent of 50*l.*, but, in many instances, of 500*l.* a year. The country did not contain a more intelligent and respectable class of men, than the farmers who were thus shut out.

Their exclusion, however, was justified by ministers on the ground,

that, however respectable they might be, they were not independent, and their admission would only increase the influence of the landholders. There was a great distinction between householders in a borough and tenants in the country: it was in the power of the landlord in the country to do his tenant much greater injury than a landlord in a town. It might be true, that a tenant at will was often a man of substance, and might have five or six hundred pounds vested in a farm for which he paid 50*l.* a year; but this made him the more dependent upon his landlord. If he were turned out, he would not lose, of course, his stock or his crops, but he would lose what he had expended in the improvement of the land; and all who were acquainted with the employment of capital upon land, must be aware of the inconvenience and loss to which a tenant was put, if obliged to quit at a short notice, when he had calculated upon a longer period of possession. But although it would no doubt be an inconvenience to a 10*l.* householder in a town, to be removed from his shop, he could remove his whole stock, carry with him all or nearly all his business, and would suffer little or nothing. Moreover, if you put tenants at will in a situation where they might vote against their landlords, you were taking a step towards the ballot.

A large number of the usual supporters of ministers differed from them on this occasion. They thought the amendment would be in furtherance of all the principles of the bill. It would increase the constituency in counties, which had become necessary in consequence of the creation of large boroughs in the counties. The bill



intended to give the right of voting in boroughs to all persons occupying a house for which they paid four shillings a week, and was it meant to be contended that the man who paid 50*l.* a year for a farm was not as worthy of the franchise as such a householder? The influence, which might be exercised by a landlord, would be ten times stronger in the case of a householder than of a farmer. The former might be turned out of his tenancy at a week's notice — on the very eve of an election; but the yearly renter of a farm could not be turned out on less than six months' notice. In fact, as matters stood, a good tenant was as neces-

sary to the landlord, as a good farm or landlord was to the tenant. Other supporters of the bill, again, declared that this amendment coupled with the division of the counties would destroy the independence of the county representation — that they never would have supported the division of the counties, if they had suspected that tenants at will were to be introduced, and, if this amendment were carried, they would vote for any motion to get rid of the dividing clause.

On the division, ministers were left in a minority of eighty-four. They then adopted the amendment, incorporating it with their own clause.



## CHAP. VIII.

*Continuation of Committee on Reform Bill—Mr. Hunt's amendment on the £10 franchise, to the effect of admitting universal suffrage—Amendment, that freeholders in boroughs shall vote for the borough, and not for the county—Motion, that the £10 rent shall not be payable more frequently than quarterly—Discussions regarding existing rights of franchise—Discussions on the clauses directing the mode of registration and regulating elections—Consideration of the report of the Bill—Motion, that Aldborough be totally disfranchised—Alterations made on considering the report—Debate on motion that the bill pass—Motion carried by a majority of 109.*

**B**Y the 24th of August, the committee had reached the clause which went to create the new and uniform constituency for the boroughs, enacting, that the franchise should belong to every male person of full age, and not subject to any "legal incapacity," who should have occupied, as owner or tenant, for twelve months next previous to the 1st of February, 1832, or the last of August in any succeeding year, "any house assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, or any house, warehouse, or counting-house, being either separately or jointly with any land owned and occupied therewith, or occupied therewith under the same landlord, of the clear yearly value of not less than 10*l.* or rated to the relief of the poor upon the yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, or any house, warehouse, or counting-house, for which, whether separately or jointly with any land occupied therewith under the same landlord, he shall be *bonâ fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than 10*l.*, if duly registered according to the provisions hereinafter contained." This clause, and

arrangements connected with it, occupied a week; many of the proposed amendments coming from the reformers themselves.

Mr. Hunt took the lead, by moving an amendment for the introduction of universal suffrage, viz., that "every male person of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, being a householder, and paying rates and taxes, shall have a right to vote" in elections for the places in which he was a householder. He maintained that this scale of franchise, far from being visionary, had been the ancient practice of the constitution, the purity of which ministers had declared it was their object to restore. Till the reign of Henry VI., every freeman was entitled to vote, without any other qualification. It was only the 8th Henry VI. which disfranchised three-fourths of the electors, by requiring possession of a 40*s.* freehold. Even the present bill had a good deal of universal suffrage. The clause, as it now stood, would be universal suffrage to householders in the neighbourhood of London, for the lowest houses let for from 10*l.* to 12*l.*; but



in Manchester, Bolton, Preston, and similar towns, the lower houses, such as weavers lived in, let for from 5*l.* to 7*l.* Therefore the clause dealt differently with householders near London, and householders in large towns in the country. In the latter, there was a class of persons holding 5*l.* houses, who were superior to the occupiers of 10*l.* or 12*l.* houses in London. He was satisfied the measure of ministers would not give the satisfaction that was anticipated, and therefore he proposed his own plan, as being much more simple, intelligible, and effective, than their partial and yet complicated scheme.

Lord Althorp admitted that the plan was a very simple one, but it was equally true that it was contrary to the principle of this bill, which had been approved of by a large majority of the country. It would alter the whole character of the bill, and make the elective franchise depend upon mere personal rights. It would be impossible to carry through parliament any bill, founded on the principle of universal suffrage, or a principle next to that of universal suffrage; and the adoption of such a proposition would alarm a very large class of sincere and honest reformers. He objected to it as being one that would extend the elective franchise too far in this country, and because the adoption of such a proposition would effectually prevent the success of any reform at all. Mr. Hunt, however, divided the committee, but found nobody to vote with him.

The next amendment proceeded from colonel Davies, likewise a reformer, who, having formerly opposed the incorporation of borough freeholders with the counties, now again moved, "that the owners of

freeholds within cities or boroughs, shall vote at the election of members for such cities or boroughs, and shall not vote at the election of the members for the county." His object was, to provide for some boroughs a sufficient constituency within their own limits, without invading that of the county; and now that tenants at will had been admitted, it was of infinitely greater importance than it formerly had been, to preserve untouched the more independent freehold constituency of the counties, and prevent its being drafted away to make up that of boroughs. As the bill now stood, the county of Devon possessed seven boroughs which would require seven districts to be taken out of the county, in order to give those boroughs the requisite number of 10*l.* houses. In Sussex, there were six of such cases; in Wiltshire, eight; and in other counties there were similar cases, in the lowest of which fifty constituents, at least, would be lost to the county. According to the bill, there were ninety-three boroughs which did not contain 300 electors each, and to make up that number, voters were to be taken from the district parishes. This provision of the bill would occasion endless disputes, litigation, and heart-burnings. East Grinstead would have to take 250 electors from the county to make up a constituency, and Amersham would require 210, whilst other places were in proportion. The opinions of the public were cool upon the bill, and those who were strong advocates for reform did not think it possible that the bill could ever be brought into practical operation. He could positively assert that the bill had very much fallen in the estimation of the city, where there



was a constituency and a public voice which he was inclined to respect. He was satisfied with schedules A and B; but when he saw the other parts of the bill went to counteract those schedules, although he did not wish to throw out the bill, he wished much to see it amended. Other members, who supported the amendment, took a different ground, contending that the rejection of it would leave the counties to be overwhelmed by a flood of borough freeholders. It was answered by ministers, that, in large towns, the amendment would serve no practical purpose, because in them there would always be a sufficiently large constituency; and in small ones it would be mischievous, for in them its only effect would be to give the large proprietors of freeholds a complete control over the elections. The number of towns, to which the proposed arrangement would apply, had been stated at ninety-three, while, in point of fact, they would not be more than one-third the number; and of this one-third, the instances of the annexed rural electors outnumbering the town voters would be so very rare as to be the exception to the rule. It was besides a mischievous fallacy to suppose that the town and the rural electors would, in these cases, be influenced by such clashing motives in the choice of representatives, that the latter would prevail, unless the former received the aid of this amendment. There was, and would be, in point of fact, no such contrariety of interests; for the farmers in the neighbourhood being the best customers of the tradesmen in the towns, there would be but one common interest between them. Besides, it was always considered and ad-

mitted, that the smaller towns, to which a rural elective population was to be annexed, should return on what, for brevity, he would call the agricultural interest; so that the very argument for strengthening the town electors against that interest was, in point of fact, a valid objection to its being adopted. The original motion was carried by a majority of 89, on which colonel Davies gave up a series of amendments, to secure to boroughs a constituency within their limits, which he intended to have moved, if this one had been carried.

Another reformer moved, that, instead of 10*l.*, 5*l.* should be inserted, but it was received with so little favour, that it was withdrawn. Another proposal, to except from the clause the boroughs in schedule C, the new boroughs, that is, which were to receive two members, for the purpose of raising the franchise in them to 20*l.* was negatived without a division. A similar fate awaited a motion by Mr. M'Kinnon, that the qualification should be 10*l.*, where the city or borough contained from 300 to 500 10*l.* houses, 15*l.* where it contained from 500 to 1,000, and 20*l.* where it contained more than 1,000. One alteration was proposed by ministers themselves. As the clause originally stood, it was necessary that a 10*l.* householder, in order to be entitled to vote, should have paid up his rent, his taxes, and his rates. It was now altered to this effect, that, if he claimed to vote as occupying a 10*l.* house, it should be necessary for him to shew that his rent had been paid; but, if he claimed to vote as being assessed for taxes and rates on a house valued at 10*l.*, it should be sufficient to have paid up his



rates and taxes, without shewing that he had paid his rent. This alteration was agreed to, although the opposition characterized it as a direct encouragement to bribery. A candidate would only have to pay up the rates and taxes of an insolvent tenant, who could not pay his rent, and bring him to the poll. Mr. Hunt moved that payment of rent should not be necessary in any case, but he found only nine members to support him.

Another, and an important amendment was moved by Mr. J. Campbell, who declared himself to be one of those who were for the bill, the whole bill, and nothing but the bill. But the bill to which this response had been given, had provided that the 10*l*. householders entitled to vote, should pay their rents at more distant intervals than were now proposed. The present bill, as originally drawn, had required that the rent should be paid half-yearly. To the clamour raised against this provision, ministers had not only yielded, but had gone so far in the other direction, that, as the clause now stood, householders, who paid weekly, would be entitled to vote. Such an enactment would give undue power to the landlords, who were not the aristocracy of the country. Suppose an individual held an hundred houses let to persons who paid weekly rents, the landlord, by giving them notice to quit on the eve of an election, might influence it materially. To prohibit landlords from giving their tenants notice to quit on the eve of an election was impossible, and the only remedy was, not to allow such tenants to enjoy the franchise. He therefore moved—and the amendment would only restore the clause to what ministers them-

selves had originally thought it ought to be—that no person should have a vote by occupying premises at a yearly rent, “if such rent shall be payable more frequently than four times in a year.”

Mr. C. Ferguson, another friend of the bill, supported the amendment, because the power, which this clause would put in the landlords' hands, would give rise to many abuses, and lead to more bribery and corrupt influence in manufacturing towns than existed at present. The object of the bill was, to create a numerous and independent constituency; but, if he were to choose between numbers and independence, he would sacrifice numbers for an independent constituency. He had no doubt that if this clause passed, three-fifths of the House would be returned by constituents who were under the influence of their landlords. On the other hand, the amendment was resisted by ministers on the ground, that it would disfranchise the whole of the operative classes in large manufacturing districts, which was contrary to the principle of the bill. The landlords' power of removing a weekly tenant was certainly an objection to the clause, but it was only under particular circumstances, and in individual cases, that the objection applied. A landlord who held a hundred houses, occupied by weekly tenants, might certainly turn them all out, but it was not likely that he would be willing to have an hundred empty houses on his hands. The amendment would exclude thousands of intelligent persons, well qualified to be intrusted with the franchise, and whom it was of importance to conciliate in favour of the institutions of the country. It would intro-



duce a most invidious distinction. Was it to be endured that, when the elective franchise had been extended in counties, and when the object of the bill was, to enlist the feelings of the mass of society in favour of government, they should refuse that franchise to a most respectable, independent, and intelligent class of voters?

Sir R. Peel asked, if it was true that these persons formed a class of most respectable, independent, and intelligent voters, how did it happen that, within six weeks of the time at which they were thus described, a bill had been laid on the table of the House to disfranchise the whole of them? At what period had it been discovered that they were a most respectable and intelligent class of voters? Government proposed to give them the right of voting by the original bill; but, after three, or, at least, two months of mature deliberation, they became alarmed at the monster which themselves had created. Like the monster in the novel, it was endowed with powers of vitality, but when it opened its eyes, and ministers found that they could not infuse judgment and discretion into it, they shrunk appalled from the work of their own hands. Ministers then came down with another bill, by which they attempted to establish a more discreet class of voters—namely, those who paid their rent half-yearly. The real reason of the introduction of the clause, which gave the right of voting to this intelligent and respectable class was, that government had excited hopes which they were afraid to disappoint. That was the reason, and the only reason, which could justify the introduction of the clause, but ministers shrank from acknow-

ledging it. When the government told the artisans of Birmingham and Manchester that they should have the right of voting, and when the proposition became the subject of discussion in the political unions, it was not to be wondered at that ministers introduced the clause into the bill. But why did they not maturely consider their plan in the first instance? Why did they first propose to give the right of voting to hundreds of thousands of persons which was now said to be their number, and, six weeks after, bring in a bill to take it away, and then once more propose it again? In his opinion, there was no class of voters more likely to be under the influence of their landlords than tenants who were liable to be ejected at a week's notice. Manchester, Norwich, Birmingham, and other large towns, would have a sufficiently large constituency without this extension of the franchise. Surely a constituency of 4,000 or 5,000 voters would be quite enough to express the sense of a town. That sense would never be more efficiently expressed by having 20,000 or 30,000 voters. In fact, such a constituency would only have the effect of overbearing the more intelligent and respectable class of electors. The system, which this clause would establish, would be an imitation of the elective franchise of the United States in its worst feature.

The division shewed a majority of 68 in favour of the original motion.

To guard against the consequences which had been pointed out, Mr. H. Hughes moved, that a weekly tenant, who should receive notice to quit, between the dissolution of one parliament



and the election of another, should still have a right to vote; but the amendment was negatived, as doing away with all qualification, and giving a right to vote without possession of a house, which was contrary to the principles of the bill. An amendment, however, was agreed to, which provided that no person should vote who, within the twelve months prior to any last of August, had received parochial relief.

By the twenty-second clause of the bill, all existing rights of election were preserved to existing freemen during their lives, if they resided within seven miles of the place for which they voted: all others, as being non-residents, were disfranchised at once. It was moved as an amendment, that all such existing rights of franchise, arising from birth, servitude, or marriage, should remain unimpaired, and not be limited to the life-time of those who now enjoyed them. It was argued, that the clause, as it stood, was contrary to justice and to the principle of the bill, narrowing the franchise in many places, instead of extending it. In the smaller boroughs, the numbers of the electors would be diminished, in consequence of the smaller number of 10*l*. houses, occupation of which alone was to give the franchise, when the existing rights should have died out. One of the members for Lancaster, and a supporter of the bill, stated, that his constituents at present amounted to between 3,000 and 4,000 voters, while there were only 550 10*l*. houses. In Great Grimsby, according to the statement of one of its representatives, the voters would be reduced from 400 to 100. One of the members for Gloucester stated,

that, among those whom he termed "the free women," there was a very strong feeling against this clause. In that city, there were various valuable charities for the maintenance of the widows, and the education of the children of freemen. To acquire a right to the benefit of such charities, the husband or the father must have taken up the freedom, for which there was a trifling fee, amounting to a few shillings. Now, the ladies feared, and he thought these fears were well grounded, that if the right of voting were taken away, the freemen would frequently neglect to take up their freedom, and that even those who might save a pittance from their weekly earnings to enable them to do so, would be tempted, from various causes, to spend the money so saved in other ways; and before a second sufficient saving could be made, the wife might be a widow, and the children orphans, cut off for ever from the benefit of such charities. Sir M. Ridley, a reforming member for Newcastle, declared that the right of resident freemen was the right which the House should be most anxious to preserve, and, in common justice, he must vote for the amendment.

Lord John Russell, Mr. Stanley, and the Attorney-general considered the amendment utterly inadmissible. If the rights of freemen were to be preserved for ever, the House would next be asked to preserve the right of the scot and lot voters; if they did so, then the freeholders would have a right to complain that their rights had not been preserved to them. So that one by one, each of those classes of voters would claim to be excepted from the operation of the disfranchising clause of this bill.



They would not deny that the resident freemen were a respectable class of voters in such boroughs as Newcastle and Gloucester, and places of that description; but while their rights were preserved to all existing freemen under this clause during their lives, there would, in all those places, be soon produced, under the operation of the twenty-first clause, a sufficient constituency, and a better regulated and more extended franchise, than hitherto existed there. It was necessary that some limits should be placed to numbers, and ministers had taken their stand upon giving privileges wherever they could be safely given, and in withholding them only where the balance of the public convenience required it. Because independence was secured by numbers, it did not follow that all numbers were to be admitted; and the question was, whether ministers had drawn a judicious line? A triumphant appeal, moreover, had been made to the existing electors, and they had loudly declared, by their conduct in the elections, their acceptance of the bill which contained this very clause.

Sir Robert Peel thought it would be difficult to conceive a more miserable case than that on which the House was desired thus to decree a total forfeiture of ancient corporate rights. The freemen were said to be good and honourable men, and yet all their reward was to be a forfeiture of their privileges. They were said to be such disinterested advocates of reform, as to be willing to sacrifice their own franchises rather than endanger the bill; but they were reduced to no such alternative, for it was not inconsistent with the bill that the corporate

right should be preserved inviolate; and, moreover, ministers would not feel themselves justified in withdrawing the bill, if they were defeated upon this clause. The amendment steered clear of the objection, that out-voters of boroughs were exposed to bribery; for it gave no freedom, but only confirmed it to those who, by the existing law, were entitled to it by birth, marriage, or service, and who resided within seven miles of the town. The time would come, when all who had held corporate privileges would not be satisfied with their being utterly excluded from their rights, and that, too, in a constitution where all other hereditary rights are maintained. The 10*l.* a-year householders in small towns, from the value of property would be more educated and respectable than the same class of persons in large towns, and this inequality might be corrected by continuing the corporate rights. Sir C. Wetherell, too, thought it impossible to defend this clause on any principle, moral, political, or legal. The preceding clause gave the right of voting to persons who at present did not possess it, while this one disfranchised those who, as freemen, now enjoyed it; and this disfranchisement involved a principle, which went equally to subvert every other species of privilege enjoyed under the constitution. The country knew that the right of freemen to vote for the representatives of towns and boroughs was an hereditary right, and that, the principle once adopted of attacking and spoliating hereditary rights, no man could take it upon him to say where it would end. There were two modes of destroying hereditary rights—either to begin at the top and go down to



the bottom, or to begin at the bottom and ascend to the top. If they looked to the proceedings of a neighbouring state—that is, to the reformers of that country—they would see a striking illustration of the former mode of attacking hereditary rights and privileges: the present clause, by which the hereditary rights of the freemen of England were to be at one fell swoop destroyed for ever, was an instance of the inverse mode of attack, preferred by the popular reformers of this country. He should like to know on what ground ministers, having once acted upon the monstrous principle of robbing the freemen of England of the elective rights which they had enjoyed and inherited for centuries, could refuse to their “movement”—allies the spoliation of the other hereditary rights and privileges, which were at present part and parcel of the constitution? The Paymaster of the Forces, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer belonged to the hereditary peerage of England, and if they wrested from the boroughs and corporate towns their most cherished hereditary rights, on what ground could they refuse their assent to a proposition which would reduce them to citizen Russell and citizen Spencer? Ministers disfranchised the smaller boroughs for no reason but because they were small, and now most inconsistently proposed to disfranchise the corporations of the large towns merely because they were large. Then let them look at the monstrous inconsistency of applying the same principle to the non-resident and the resident freemen, and the inconsistency of a ministry vaunting of its attention to popular rights, beginning the sys-

tem of spoliation of the hereditary rights of the democratic portion of the community. But let them beware: the principle of spoliation once adopted, those corporate privileges which were expressly secured by Magna Charta being thus trampled upon, they might soon be called upon to join the present opponents of the bill, in defending not only the hereditary rights and privileges of the peerage of England, but of the monarch himself. In this clause was planted the seed of the destruction of our monarchical institutions; for the right, on which the hereditary succession to the throne was founded, and by which the peers enjoyed their titles and property, was the same in kind and degree as that by which the freemen of England enjoyed the right of franchise in corporations. The original clause was retained by a majority of 79.

All the clauses which seemed to involve matter of principle having been now discussed, the remaining clauses, relating principally to the registration of the electors, and the manner of taking the poll, were much more rapidly gone through, sixteen of them having been disposed of in one day. The whole machinery of the proposed system of representation was strongly opposed as being cumbersome and inconvenient; laying unnecessary expense on the county, on parishes, and on the candidates; tending necessarily to create and foster endless litigation, and useful only to the crowd of unfledged barristers who were to perform the duty of judges, and from whom there was to be no appeal, but to a committee of the House. Some condemned the system of registration altogether, as



an expensive and unnecessary encumbrance; others thought a good plan of registration both a desirable and an attainable object, but could not concede that character to the scheme which was now proposed. It was said to be copied *verbatim* from a plan which had been submitted to the consideration of a committee in 1827, which Mr. Tierney had described as being "impracticable—as mere moonshine," and which accordingly had been dropped. It was to be observed, however, that the introduction of one uniform franchise might afford facilities for registration which did not previously exist.

The barristers, who were annually to revise and decide upon the electoral lists, receiving a fee of five guineas a-day, were to be named by the judges of assize for the time, the lord Chancellor having a veto. Sir C. Wetherell complained, that these would be political appointments, as the Chancellor would have his way; and to say that the nomination would rest with the judges, was mummery. The judges ought to refuse to exercise the functions of appointing these barristers, and each ought to exclaim—*non est mihi*. But these barristers were to be restrained from being candidates for Parliament for eighteen months after the termination of their functions; and yet the commissioners under the bill were under no such restraint, though he should say, what was sauce for the goose was sauce for the gander. He objected to the appointments altogether as unconstitutional. The whole measure was an unconstitutional delegation of the privileges of the House to inferior persons. But one provision of the clause was, that

if any of these barristers were to depart wilfully from the law, he was to be liable to an action of debt, and afterwards to be amenable at the suit of the attorney-general. What respectable person would accept of appointments under such degrading and onerous conditions? The pay of these persons was to be low enough, and yet, as there were to be about 65 of them, though their pay was much too small, they would cost the country 20,000*l.* a-year. This was a source of patronage to ministers, who claimed a popularity for not creating appointments, and for diminishing the expenses of the country. Sir E. Sugden suggested, that no barrister should be employed on the circuit on which he practised, and could not see why the chancellor should have a veto, when not only the high character of the judges, but their practical knowledge of the attainments of the profession, so much better qualified them to form an accurate opinion as to the merits of the functionaries.—The attorney-general admitted that the remuneration to be given was not great, but that in itself was not surely an objection, since it could not concern the legislature whether the fee were sufficient or not, if the parties themselves were satisfied with their remuneration, and competent to the discharge of the functions imposed on them. Undoubtedly none who were incompetent would be employed; but there were many barristers of great legal attainments without business, who would gladly apply themselves to the task for the consideration of which others spoke so lightly. The station of the bar itself, the discrimination of the judges who made the selection, and the *veto* of the Lord Chancellor who controlled them,



were satisfactory guarantees for the propriety of the appointments. It was objected, too, that these barristers were not armed with sufficient authority, as they had no power by the bill to compel the attendance of witnesses whose evidence might be necessary; to which it was answered, that such a power was unnecessary, as the parties interested would be ready enough to appear without the use of compulsory measures.

To the clause, likewise, which enacted that, at an election, the polling should be finished in two days, various objections were stated, and that not by the opposition alone. There were many non-resident freeholders who, if the time were not extended, would be prevented from voting. This would be particularly the case in the larger counties. One of the members for Yorkshire stated, that in the West Riding of that county, it would be impossible to poll, in two days, one half of the electors who would exist under the present bill. Others thought that the poll might be taken in two days, but that the intervening day which the clause allowed, between the first day of the election and the commencement of the polling, would not afford sufficient time, where a contest suddenly arose, to give notice throughout a county, and to prepare the machinery which the bill rendered necessary in a county election. Lord Althorp thought that no difficulty would arise, so great would be the facilities created by the new arrangements. In the West Riding of Yorkshire, for instance, there would be fifteen places for taking the poll. At each of those fifteen places, as many booths for receiving the votes of the electors as might be thought

VOL. LXXIII.

necessary, might be opened. Thus the polling would go on fifteen times quicker than at present; and the unlimited number of booths which might be opened, combined with the facility afforded by the register, would enable all the voters, even in that large district, to record their votes in the space of two days. It had been shewn, by the case of Norwich, that it was possible, even with a large constituency, to close the poll in two days; and if the arrangements for the same purpose could be as easily made elsewhere, the House should pass the clause in its present shape, in order to compel them to be made.

On the 7th of September, the committee finished its labours, which had begun on the 13th of July, and the bill as amended was reported to the House. The 13th, 14th, and 15th, were occupied in considering the report, to which the House agreed, with certain alterations which were chiefly verbal. Ministers had placed the borough of Aldborough in schedule B, because its population entitled it to be there; but one of their adherents now moved as an amendment, that it should be transferred to schedule A, and totally disfranchised, as being the "prototype of insignificance and corruption," which must be destroyed in justice to Gatton and Old Sarum. Lord John Russell opposed the amendment, as being hostile to the principles of the bill, and to the rules by which the disfranchising schedules had been framed. Ministers, in framing this schedule, had adopted a well-known rule, and as that rule excluded all boroughs which had more than 2,000 inhabitants, this borough obtained the benefit of the exception. It was true that

[Q]



Aldborough in the first instance stood in this schedule; but it having been subsequently represented to ministers that, by adding the borough and the parish together, the population would amount to more than 2,000, and they having found, on consulting the population returns, that that representation was correct, Aldborough was excluded from schedule A, and transferred to schedule B. There was no sufficiently precise or accurate statement to warrant the House in coming to the conclusion that in this borough, in the parish, and in the immediate neighbourhood, there was not a sufficient number of 10*l*. householders to entitle it to send one member to Parliament. The amendment was lost by eighty-five. On the other hand, the wishes of several members who had complained that Wales was not allowed its proper share of county representation, induced ministers to give an additional member to Denbighshire, with 76,000 inhabitants and to Carmarthenshire with 96,000. But as this addition interfered with the adjustment between the agricultural and commercial interests, which ministers contended was to be found in their bill, they placed two new towns among those which were to receive one member—Ash-ton-under-Line in Lancashire, and Stroud and Minchinhampton in Gloucestershire.

The third reading was carried by a majority of fifty-five, in a House which consisted of only 171 members, in consequence of the division taking place unexpectedly, without any discussion. On the motion, however, that the bill do pass, arose a debate which continued during the 19th, 20th, and 21st of September. The opposition described the scheme contained in

the bill, now that it had received the last finishing touches of its fashioners, as being no less inconsistent and ruinous than when they had put forth their first rough draft, having only superadded to the extravagance of its original principles, a mass of crudities, contradictions, and partialities in their application. In its essence, it was venturing upon a new and untried state of being, by way of a gigantic experiment not only more than hazardous, but the very scale of which was an insuperable objection to its adoption. Following a more moderate course, you might stop, or you might return; but the course now pursued was of that kind, that, however, mischievous it might be found in its results, to retreat was impossible. On the contrary, while ministers declared that they had now done all that well-ordered liberty required, downward progression in the path of pure democracy was the inevitable consequence of every thing they had done. This reform was proposed, with the ostensible object of bringing back the constitution to what it had been before it was deformed by an accumulation of abuses, and of rendering the House of Commons what was called a pure and independent representation of the people; but, in the constitution of England, the House of Commons never had been, never was intended to be, and never ought to be, a pure and independent representation of what was called the people, free from any intermixture of the influence of the crown and of the aristocracy. And yet this change was to be made at a time when no living man could deny, that not only were the people more influential in the House of Commons than at any



former period, but when no influence could there resist its deliberate and reasonable voice. Of this folly there was only one aggravation—that all these changes were to be introduced for the purpose of getting rid of a constitution under which the country had outstripped the whole civilized globe in every thing that constituted the happiness and the honour of a nation. The bill was out and out a democratic bill, framed, if not with the design, yet with the inevitable effect, according to its natural tendencies, of overthrowing every thing that might stand in the way of a levelling democracy, and of the wild passions in which a democracy loves to revel—of putting an end to the monarchy and aristocracy, and of forming a Parliament out of delegates for districts, who, repeating the ebullitions of the public voice, might overpower any accents raised in defence of the other branches of the constitution. It was demonstrable, that if you so constitute the popular branch of the legislature, possessing as it did the power of stopping every movement of the government, as to render it an echo of the voice of the multitude, you take the first and most certain step to a republic—to a government consisting of as many tyrants as there might be members in the majority of the House of Commons. The very clamour, by the existence of which the measure was attempted to be justified, and which had itself been artfully encouraged by all manner of popular delusion, was a foretaste of the unthinking violence to which government must come to be subjected. This was the first occasion on which any government, swaying the destinies of a great and prosperous nation, had thrown

down before the people the right of settling all the principles by which they would choose to be governed. By this monstrous bribe they had roused their passions and prejudices, and had called them not to decide what reason would suggest, but what would gratify their own imagined interests.

The consequence was, that the bill went directly to place government in the hands of numbers independent of property: such would necessarily be the effect of the 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  qualification. In Manchester for instance the number of persons occupying houses of from 10 $\frac{1}{2}$  to 20 $\frac{1}{2}$  rent was greater by one third than that of persons occupying more valuable houses; thus the real property of the town would not only not be represented, but would be borne down by the majority of the lower classes of inhabitants and such would be the case in all the great manufacturing towns. The incessant references which ministers made to the majority they had secured, and their general answer to all objections—that the bill was one which the people had accepted—was the best proof of the small quantity of wisdom, and the superabundance of blind prejudice and vague theory which had presided over this piece of legislation. It was the most ridiculous of all things to pretend, that the multitudes of electors who had returned this majority could weigh or could even understand, all the provisions of this new constitution, many of which still continued unintelligible even to the House. The ablest lawyers on both sides had admitted their inability to expound its principles or provisions, and yet every parish officer in the kingdom was expected to make himself master of both at a glance. The



support of the people had been gained by artfully cherished delusions, that this measure would remove all their grievances and burthens, reduce the taxes, and remove the national debt. In one way these expectations might be partially fulfilled, for a democratic legislature was to be created, turning round blindly at every breath of popular will, which would soon find the way to injustice and confiscation.

On the part of ministers, Mr. Macauley denied that the framers or supporters of the bill had ever held out, that it would remove the burthens which affected the working classes, by giving them high wages, while it materially lowered the amount of their taxes. This was a mere artful assertion of the sworn foes of reform, and had no foundation in fact or reason. Neither ministers nor the unofficial supporters of the bill attempted to delude the people into its acceptance by such an unworthy artifice. No; they knew too well that no ministry—no legislative measure—could accomplish such results, and were too honest in their purpose to pretend to acts beyond their capacity. The end of government was not to make the people rich by irregular or illegal means, but to protect them in the acquisition and possession of their riches, and to remove all unnecessary obstacles to that acquisition. No honest government could affect to do more, —no honest government could affect to do less. No ministry could presume to do more than direct and provide for the general weal, and could not take upon them the office of the prophet in the wilderness, and by their official wand make water to flow from the rock to ease the burthens of the people. It was never, then, pretended that

the reform bill would necessarily of itself do away with the burthens which oppressed the working classes and industry of the country; all that was asserted was the undeniable fact, that had we had a reformed parliament fifty years ago, the national embarrassments would not have been a tithe of their present amount. He believed the present bill would ultimately improve the physical condition of the people, because its first result would be a more equal and judicious distribution of the public burthens than at present existed. To reproach it for not doing more was to reproach it for not accomplishing what no constitutional legislative measure, nor any ministry in the world, could accomplish; and any ministry or legislature that professed to do more, by the very fact of profession proved themselves to be arrant quacks. The supporters of the bill had been much taunted with having shut their eyes on facts and experience, and been guided solely by the mere abstractions of theory. The very reverse was the truth; facts and experience were the groundwork of the bill, while hypothetical assertions were the only weapons with which its opponents had condescended to oppose it. For example, look at all their bugbear assumptions with respect to the dangers—democratic dangers—of enabling the inhabitants of a large town—Manchester to wit—to return their own representatives. Were they not all in the very teeth of the facts and experience for neglecting which those members opposite were so loud in charging ministers? No public man, it was said, whatever his pretensions, can have a chance under the bill to represent a large town; the repre-



representatives of the populous towns will be chosen on exclusively local considerations. Now what said "facts and experience" on this point? Let Nottingham—let Leicester,—let Chester answer the question. To come nearer home, the representation of the metropolis was a clear proof that non-resident public men had a chance in populous districts, and that local considerations were not the sole guide in these places. Did hon. members recollect the great men who, within all or most of their recollections, had represented Westminster and Southwark? Mr. Fox, Mr. Sheridan, Mr. Tierney, Sir S. Romilly—surely no mob-orator—no hustings demagogue. The dangers, which, it was apprehended, would flow from passing the bill, were chimerical, but those which would result from a different course were real. He had supported the bill on a former occasion, because he had believed there was danger in refusing it, in the then state of public opinion, and he supported it still more cordially now, because that danger had been much augmented. It was deplorable infatuation to suppose that the public mind had cooled, or would cool, on this subject, till the object had been achieved. The people, having given vent to their joy when the reform measure was first introduced, became tranquil and contented, as natural to those who anticipated a triumph. After this, General Gascoyne's motion evinced to them their danger, and again were they roused, and they showed their sentiments in every possible manner. Again did they triumph gloriously as far as they were concerned, and as far as reform depended upon their representatives. They placed the bill

in security, and again did they return to their repose. At this moment the people were, as they had been on the very eve of General Gascoyne's motion, waiting with anxious interest and resolution the result of the measure;—but, because they were not violent, they were again told that there was a re-action in the public mind. Those who thought that there could be any such re-action were utterly ignorant of the public mind, they were utterly unacquainted with the very nature of that people whom they aspired to govern. The measure of Catholic emancipation had broken the last link of attachment on the part of the people to their Tory leaders, and reform became the first question that occupied the minds of all men. The people of England had long been disposed to move in its favour upon the slightest impulse; and he should as soon think of seeing them revert to the drowning of witches, or to the burning of heretics, as to find a re-action in favour of Old Sarum. It was as probable that the people should go back to their attachment to Thor or Odin, as that they should revert to any attachment to the old system of representation. Revolutions produced by the excitement of feelings would produce re-actions, but the victories of reason once gained were gained for ever. The calmness of the people of England was not the calmness of indifference, it was the calmness of confident hope, and in proportion to the confidence of hope was the bitterness of disappointment. In that house, continued Mr. Macauley, the dread of disappointment was gone; but members who opposed the measure expressed their hope that the barons of England would interfere to curb the ca-



reer of what they termed this democratic frenzy. If the peers valued the voice of example and experience, let them look to the long line of deserted halls and desolate mansions of a certain quarter of a neighbouring capital. From those mansions and castles of the aristocracy of France, as proud and as powerful a body of nobles as ever existed were driven forth to exile and to beggary, to implore the charity of hostile religions and of hostile nations. And why did such destruction fall upon them? Why were they swept away with such utter destruction? Why was their heritage given to strangers, and their palaces dismantled, but because they had no sympathy with the people? Because they reviled those who warned them of their danger, when they might have been saved; and because they absolutely refused to make any concessions, until all concessions were too late. Those who would tell the aristocracy of England to keep the body of the people from power, would place them in the exact situation in which the aristocracy of France had been placed. It was the duty of that house to treat with respect the privileges of the House of Peers, but it was likewise their duty not to neglect their own. Many who heard him thought that the rejection of the bill would be the means of their being restored to power. Dark was the day of their flight from power, and darker for England would be the day of their return, for they would return in triumph over the people of the British empire, united as firmly as when the armada had sailed up the channel, or as when the army of Napoleon was encamped at Boulogne. They could sustain them-

selves only in the utter scorn of public opinion, and if they fell, they might involve in their fall the whole frame of society. It would be the duty of that House to convey the wishes of the people to a patriot king. The place of that House was in front of the nation, and whatever prejudices might exist elsewhere, in that House, when freely elected, would be found the virtue, the wisdom, the energy, and courage that would save the country.

Mr. Croker thought that the boldness of Mr. Macauley in teaching the peers of England what they ought to do was only equalled by the magnanimous disregard of history and fact on which the lesson had been founded. The nobility of France fell, forsooth, because they refused concessions till concessions were too late. All men knew that precisely the reverse was the truth of the case. The French nobility made extravagant concessions to the people; and it was those concessions which had involved them in ruin. Was not the hon. member aware that the peers of France had conceded the point of joining the *Tiers Etat*? Was he not aware that it was a Montmorency who proposed the abolition of nobility; and a Noailles that moved for the destruction of signorial rights, whilst the archbishop of Paris brought forward the plan for yielding up the tithes—a measure so strong, that even the Abbé Gregoire considered it too bold for him to support? The French noblesse may have fallen because they yielded too far to democratic intimidation, or they might not have stood if they had refused to yield: but to tell men who could read history, that they fell because they refused



concessions, was a mere disregard of all facts for the purposes of rhetorical declamation. A similar disregard of fact was manifested in setting forth, that modern abuses had converted the House of Commons into a mockery of representation for all practical purposes. It was still that system under which, from its first regular establishment, the country had become what it was; for it was not even pretended that there had been any change in the constitution of the House of Commons since the Revolution. Not a single county, not one rotten borough, had been added to the representation. Not a hint had been given that the power of the Crown had increased in that House—and the very majority now arrayed in favour of the reform bill proved that the bill was unnecessary; for it was difficult to conceive of an intellect so framed as to look at the majority now ruling the House, returned, too, as they were told it had been returned, by the mere constitutional action of popular sentiment, and yet maintain that popular sentiment was so utterly incapable of being represented under the existing system, that the government had been turned over, in defiance of the people, into the hands of an oligarchy.

In regard to the bill itself, he would not charge ministers personally with partiality and favouritism; but he would say, that had they been actuated by those motives, they would have done just what they had done. He would mention one instance—there were twenty others. St. Germain's had 2,400 inhabitants, and thirteen 10<sup>l</sup>. houses; but was to send no member. There was another borough, which had really not 2,000

inhabitants, but nominally 2,600, and fourteen 10<sup>l</sup>. houses; and what had been done with this other borough? Was it disfranchised? No. Of course, then, it had been left in schedule B. No such thing; it had been removed from schedule B, and remained in the body of the bill, and was to send two members. This was the borough of Westbury; and a vacancy had been made in that borough; and a gentleman who had an interest in the bill had been elected member for Westbury. Suffolk had 70,000 inhabitants more than Durham, it was double the size, and the taxes paid by Suffolk were four times the amount of those of Durham; yet Suffolk was mulcted of nine members, and the representation of Durham had been increased. Then there was Northumberland, the prime minister's county: the representation in that county had been raised from seven members to eleven, whilst that of Norfolk had been reduced from twelve to eleven, although the population of Norfolk was more than double that of Northumberland, and the taxes paid by the latter country were only 22,000<sup>l</sup>. a year whilst Norfolk paid 53,000<sup>l</sup>. Just in the same manner the representation of Cumberland was to be increased, and that of Essex diminished, though the population of Cumberland was only 156,000, or excluding the represented towns, which was the fairest way, only 115,000, whereas the population of Essex was 268,000. Essex was greater in extent, and her taxes amounted to nearly seven times those of Cumberland. The changes and alterations which had been made in the bill had imported into it a greater mass of absurdity than was credible by those who had not



examined it attentively. Instead of twenty-six great counties there were to be fifty-two small counties, so that the counties which were not to be favoured with four members were to be put off with two, whilst the little counties which had three, were to keep their three; the electors in Oxford, Berks, Bucks, Hertford, and Hereford, were to have their three votes for three members, but those of Lancashire were to have only two votes for two members. The result of this was, that the West Riding of Yorkshire, which was to return two members, had more electors than five counties together, which returned fifteen members. This was the rule of proportion adopted by ministers. Cumberland was to get four members, two for each of its parts; whilst Bolton-le-Moors, which had a population greater than one of the parts, was to have only one, and Chelsea none at all. He did not charge it against ministers, but it appeared to him that this mode of treating Cumberland was a trick, and he should believe it to be so, till he heard an answer. There was not a single page of the bill which did not contain anomalies, absurdities, and grounds for suspicion of partiality. One great object, professed to be sought after by many clauses and great variety of complicated arrangements, was the diminution of the expenses of elections; but it appeared to him to be demonstrable that the expenses would be increased. At present the law allowed of no more than one poll of fifteen days' duration; but by this bill they might have polls in fifteen different parts of the county for two days, which, according to his arithmetic, was equivalent to thirty days' polling. Then, too,

they must have fifteen lawyers, fifteen agents, fifteen sets of poll-clerks, fifteen booths, fifteen, ay, perhaps thirty taverns; and thus every county contest, which cost at present 10,000*l.*, would cost 100,000*l.* for the future. It had been argued, that by taking the poll in districts, voters would not have to travel so far, nor to eat so much. But ministers, when it was proposed on that side of the House, to take the poll in parishes, argued that the saving of distance would be greatly counterbalanced by the additional number of poll clerks and agents which it would be necessary to employ. He had, therefore, their authority for setting off poll clerks and agents against travelling expenses. But would any saving, in fact, be made in travelling expenses? The bill would actually double the travelling expenses. There was to be a nomination day, and then a day was to intervene before the commencement of the poll. Thus the voters would have to go to the place of nomination, and having eaten their dinner, which, as well as their travelling expenses, the candidates must pay for, it would be necessary to carry them back to the places from which they came, and thence to the fifteen polling places. Neither would the country escape a large expenditure, in paying the barristers who were to preside over the inconvenient and impracticable scheme of registration, by which expenditure was to be purchased an increase of patronage to the Crown, and the subjection to government of the bar of England. He revered and honoured the profession of the law, because he had always seen it foremost in the battles for civil and religious liberty; and therefore it



was that he could not refrain from holding up this part of the bill to public contempt and indignation. By the proposed division of the counties, by the separation of the Isle of Wight from Hampshire, and by that trumpery which we were now going to substitute for all that was venerable in our constitution, we had created sixty-eight counties, and to these sixty-eight counties, sixty-eight barristers were to be appointed annually to decide votes and try causes: ay, and these barristers were only to have five guineas a day. He would undertake to say, that a whisper would soon be heard, that these five guineas ought to be made ten, and then that they ought to be made fifteen, and then, peradventure, that they ought to be made twenty guineas, and twenty guineas they soon would be made, and twenty guineas they ought to be made. On one occasion, whilst he was in office, having a great many official documents to sign, he had determined to see how many of them he could sign on a long summer's day foregoing his breakfast and dinner; and he found that, work as hard as he could he could not get through more than 5,000 or 6,000. Now the barrister must be able to register the votes faster than he could sign his name, if he could get through the task of registration in less than ten days. That being the case, these barristers would soon be made permanent officers in their respective counties, with salaries of 400*l.* or 500*l.* a year, and in course of time would become most important political functionaries and all this was by way of diminishing the influence of the Crown.

After discussing at great length

the list of the commissioners by whom the counties were to be divided, and the boroughs defined, many of whom he contended were most unfit persons to be named, from the relation in which they stood to the bill, or to government, Mr. Croker proceeded to say, that the measure, in its essence and tendency, went to overturn the ancient constitution of the country. He was satisfied, that if they passed the present bill, and if the House of Lords should be intimidated into an adoption of it, the revolution would have commenced, and a republic would be near at hand. Let him not be understood to say, that a republic could be established in this country—no such thing; he only meant to say, that a republic would be attempted, and would fail. But in that failure, what might happen,

“Through what variety of untried being—

“Through what new scenes and changes might we pass.”

There might be blood, there might be plunder. He believed that there might be both. Such allusions were originally none of his. He only echoed the words which had fallen from the noble lord opposite. He repelled the supposition. He believed that there was safety for England even though the reform bill was rejected. It was the vote of the House of Commons in the late Parliament—it was the vote and voice of the king, which had created the present excitement. The people of England were not turbulent; they were only obedient to a misguided cause. The people of England were not revolutionary; they only followed the commands of the constitutional authorities. The people of England



were not inclined to blood and plunder; but they were told from that House, and they were told from the throne, that their enthusiasm was patriotism, and that their violence in support of the reform bill was an imperative duty. If the two Houses of Parliament only did their duty, the constitution would be saved, and tranquillity would not be injured. The gentlemen on his side of the House had performed their duty to the best of their power; and if opprobrium were to attach to any portion of that House, it would not be to himself and his friends near him, who, without any prospect of place—without any hope of popularity—without expectation of other reward than the approbation of their own consciences, had defended to the uttermost the constitution of their country, which had been linked with its prosperity for the last century and a half. They had been there, night after night, fighting against majorities always fluctuating, but the greater part of which always consisted of men debarred from thinking; and of these majorities he would only say, that he would rather be in the minority for ever than form a part of them, when they voted first for keeping Aldborough in schedule B, and then within five minutes afterwards voted in a manner diametrically opposite, in order to keep Downton in schedule A. He admitted that if the members of those majorities wished to carry the bill, they must not examine too closely into its details. If they wished to concur in their votes upon it, they must consent to shut their eyes and not open their mouths, for if they did either the one or the other, in all probability a collision of opinion would take place among them.

Nor had he the slightest doubt, that the House of Lords would perform their duty in spite of the dangers with which weak-minded individuals were attempting to terrify them. So far was he from saying to the House of Lords that by succumbing they would save themselves, that he would go so far as to say that, if they did succumb, he should be opposed to a House of Lords. For what purpose was it they had hitherto preserved that House? for what purpose was it that they had attended its growth, and given to it the dearest pledges of their love and confidence? Why was it that until the last few days every public man had looked up to a seat in it as the greatest triumph which he could achieve,—as the greatest reward which could be tendered him for his services to his country? Was it not because the House of Lords was looked upon as the conservative branch of the constitution, and as its surest protection against the madness of temporary violence, and the enthusiasm of reckless innovation? He would, therefore, say to their lordships “Now or never must you make your stand.” What he would ask, was the use of the House of Lords? Was it, to register the edicts of the Commons, or to give a blind assent to their resolutions? If it had a will of its own and could differ from the Commons, when was the time for expressing that difference of opinion? Was it only to arrive when they could differ with safety? On the timber duties, on the wine duties, on a mere turnpike bill, the House of Commons allowed the House of Lords to throw out any bill of which they disapproved; but it was not, forsooth, to allow the House of Lords such an exercise of its undoubted



privileges, when a question of important magnitude was brought before it,—a question which divided the public mind more than any other question which had occurred in his day,—a question on which public opinion was so nearly balanced, that out of 36,000 voters who polled at the last election, there was only a majority of 1,600 found in favour of it,—a question on which the House of Commons was divided to an extent to which it had never been divided previously,—a question on which the late Parliament was divided in the proportion of 302 to 301, the unit by which the majority was gained being of a character on which, if this were the time, he had much to say,—a question on which the minority was still unexampled in amount, although they had been sent to their constituents with the king's name used against them,—a question which was more important than any which had come before Parliament since the questions of the Revolution and of the Hanover succession. If this bill came back to that House from the Lords, modified in all its objectionable parts, the House of Commons, influenced by its constitutional affection to the ancient institutions of the country, would say, "This bill, so modified, we will not reject; for if we deprive the lords of their privileges, the mob will soon deprive us of our privileges as a House of Commons." Depend upon it, that any violence which that House might exercise against the House of Lords, would only be the prelude to a similar example of violence exercised upon the House of Commons. Shut up the House of Lords, and it will not be long before the mace now on the table will be carried away as a mere

empty bauble. For there is no instance to be found in history in which, after a body of men had excited the mob to violence, the mob have not subsequently turned upon their agitators, and pulled down those who, at the commencement of their misconduct, deemed themselves superior to all external violence.

Mr. Stanley, in attempting to break the force of Mr. Croker's speech, remarked that the latter gentleman's use of ridicule in some parts of it, was scarcely reconcilable with the mighty interests and ruinous consequences which other parts represented as being involved in the question—that he had treated the House to a tune on his fiddle, even though he believed Rome to be burning: and he repelled, "with indignation and contempt," the charge of ministers having been guided by partial motives either in taking away, or in bestowing the franchise—a charge by the bye, which the Irish Secretary might have seen, was to be repelled, not by simply treating it with indignation and contempt, but by explaining it on some rational and consistent principle, the facts upon which it was founded. He denied that any change of any importance had been introduced into the bill since "it had first received the sanction of the public." Had schedule A been changed? Had schedule B been altered? And was not the franchise to be extended as at first proposed, to the great towns, to which hon. gentlemen opposite would now concede the privilege, when they found that it was impossible any longer to withhold it? In short, what one alteration had been made, which could in any degree affect the original merits of the bill which had



found favour and acceptance with the people when first presented to them? It had been mentioned that there was only a majority of 1,600 in support of it out of 36,000 polled votes. That at least showed that immense exertions had been made to procure a nominal advantage on the side of the anti-reformers at the late elections, knowing as they did, that great personal interests were involved in the result. But if they included the numbers that would have voted for reform in all the large towns and important counties throughout the kingdom, could it be doubted for a moment, that the majority out of doors would be even still greater in proportion than that which existed within the walls of that House? Had not the party been obliged to fly at the general election, without a shadow of chance, from every popular hustings which they had ventured to contest? And were there not at that moment but six county members out of the whole representation of England, who offered any opposition to the bill? But united though the people were, he did believe, that even if the Peers threw out the bill, there would be no republic, nor would there be any attempt to establish one; for the people of England were not actuated by a republican spirit, nor did they foster republican principles. But when the right hon. gentleman demanded what was our security that we should not be carried to much more desperate lengths than any which this bill sanctioned, he made answer,—we had the same security which guaranteed the success of the bill itself, the deep-rooted conviction, the indomitable energy, the resistless voice of public opinion throughout the country.

They had the same securities, he repeated, which entitled them to expect the consummation of the bill, and the sooner the safer,—which would maintain the sovereign in all the fulness of his royal supremacy, and which would preserve to the peers the legitimate exercise of their privileges. The people of England were attached to a monarchical form of government; they revered aristocracy generally, but looked up to their own aristocracy in particular, because here there was no line of demarcation drawn between the aristocratical classes of society and the people themselves, properly so called. There were in this country none peculiarly invested with special privileges to the prejudice of others; no order was exempted from taxation; and the House of Peers, as such, would be suffered at all times to enjoy to the utmost all their legitimate hereditary rights. Of their privilege of legislation the people by no means desired to deprive them; but the result of their rejection of this bill—if they did reject it, which he could not contemplate—would be a constant pressure on the peers as a body. Instead of being venerated and esteemed as the safe-guards and ornaments of the country, they would be regarded with aversion and distrust: no longer esteemed the patrons and benefactors of the poor, they would be looked upon as hard and oppressive task-masters, who wrested from the people a power which they had no right to enjoy, and assumed that which they were not entitled to claim.

The debate was enlivened by an episode arising out of the doctrines laid down by Mr. Crampton, the Solicitor-general for Ireland, brought into Parliament by minis-



ters for the borough of Milbourn Port; and no better example could be found of a very general truth viz. that men, in the pursuit of what they believe to be popular rights, will defend doctrines and practices utterly inconsistent with their safe and continued existence, if these doctrines and practices only seem fitted to lend a temporary aid to the immediate object in view. This high legal adviser of the crown, when adverting in his speech to the reception which the bill might experience in the House of Lords, said, if ever there was a bill with which the lords should feel a delicacy of interfering, and on which they should not even exercise a severity of criticism, it was this bill. It should be viewed by them as a money bill on which they ought to make no alteration. In any question affecting the rights of peers, the peers alone had the right to interfere. In any question affecting representation in the Commons, the Commons had the right to interfere without any control by the other House. He maintained that, by the common law and the usage of Parliament, the king and the House of Commons, without any interference by the other House, had the right to make regulations respecting the representation." Undismayed by the loud expressions of amazement which these doctrines called forth, Mr. Crampton proceeded to a still more tangible application of these his ideas of the constitution. "The House of Lords have no doubt a constitutional right to reject this bill; but if they do, one of its main objects may still be attained without their concurrence. The disfranchisement of all the boroughs in schedule A, with the exception of those whose right to send mem-

bers has been granted or confirmed by act of Parliament, might be effected without legislation—and this I state as a lawyer, and do not expect it will be controverted by any legal authority. The House of Commons may address the crown to dissolve Parliament, and not to issue writs to the decayed boroughs, but in lieu of them, to issue writs to the large, populous, and wealthy towns which were now unrepresented. This does not apply to the representation of Scotland and Ireland, which has been fixed by acts of union, and can be altered only by an act of Parliament; but, with regard to the decayed boroughs of England, if they do not send representatives by virtue of any local statute, I repeat, that the crown, on an address of this House, has power to issue or withhold writs, and that in this respect, the concurrence of the House of Lords is not necessary. At the same time he thought the crown should not refuse writs to any borough which was free and independent in character, containing large manufactories and a numerous population, but only to decayed places—to rotten and nomination boroughs," which necessarily meant, that the crown was to issue writs where it chose, and refuse them where it chose. To render the scene complete, Mr. Crampton, who sat for Milbourn Port, a condemned nomination borough, on being asked by sir R. Peel, if he thought that was a borough from which the crown ought to withhold a writ, did actually muster sufficient gravity to answer "no:" and, amid the inextinguishable laughter of the House, the learned Solicitor-general declared, "I admit that I owe my seat in this House to the fa-



vour of a distinguished nobleman, but, while I make this admission, I wish to be understood as exempting the borough which I represent, from being a nomination borough, in any sense of the expression. The influence enjoyed in that borough by the noble lord to whom I have alluded, is a pure and honourable influence, reflecting equal honour on him who exercises it, and those towards whom it was exercised, the influence being that of a benevolent landlord, and the homage which he received being an homage paid by gratitude to his superior virtues and elevated situation."

The Solicitor-general was heard to an end; but so soon as he had finished, Mr. W. Wynn stated, that it was absolutely necessary to know whether the doctrines now started were the doctrines of his majesty's ministers and constitutional advisers; because, if they were so, all other business must stop, until it should be settled whether the crown did, or did not, possess the prerogative now claimed for it. It was purely a question of prerogative, for every man must know, that an Address of the House of Commons, though it might administer advice as to the mode of exercising a prerogative, could neither give one nor take it away. No question of such importance had been raised since the vote of a certain House of Commons, that the House of Lords should be abolished as a nuisance. He felt the more alarmed on this point, because he could not but remember that something not very dissimilar from what the Solicitor-general now maintained had formerly fallen from the law officer for England.

Sir Charles Wetherell brought the matter to a point at once, by moving that the present debate be

now suspended. He did so, because one of the king's law officers in that House had asserted, not merely that the House of Lords ought not to criticise the Reform Bill, but that all the places enumerated in schedule A might be legally and constitutionally disfranchised by the crown, merely by withholding their writs. The House had only the choice of two modes of proceeding, either to put an end to its present piece of legislation, which, if the doctrines now stated were correct, was altogether superfluous and unnecessary, or to vindicate the rights of the Commons of England from the insult and disgrace of the attack which was now made upon them. Ministers were involved in the legal statements of their law officers, and were bound to declare their opinion. If they would disavow the doctrines of their legal adviser as illegal and unconstitutional, he was content to go on with the debate; but, if they did not, he would move that the words of the Solicitor-general be taken down, and that the debate be adjourned.

Mr. Crampton endeavoured, unsuccessfully, to explain. He complained that what he had stated had been misrepresented. "I am ready to abide," said Sir C. Wetherell, "by the decision of any one member present, whether I have or have not stated correctly the learned solicitor's proposition. He said, in plain terms, that, if the House of Lords should reject the bill, ministers had nothing to do but dissolve parliament, and then the crown might withhold the writs from the boroughs in schedule A." No answer being given to the challenge, lord Althorp rose, and disclaimed the doctrines which had been put forward. He could



not, he said, admit that, because an individual connected with the government expressed an opinion on a point of law, a pending discussion should be stopped, until ministers declared whether they concurred in that opinion. The appeal which had been made to government was not according to the usages of the House. The opinion expressed by the Solicitor-general for Ireland had been propounded without the slightest communication with any of the ministers, and was an opinion on a legal, rather than a constitutional case. He would have great diffidence in expressing an opinion on the point of law; but, if he were called upon to say whether the course pointed out by the Solicitor-general for Ireland was a constitutional course, he was perfectly ready to say, that he thought it was not. Sir Robert Peel admitted that, in ordinary circumstances, it was not usual to make members of the government responsible for the opinions of subordinate officers; but the question, in the present case, was a question of prerogative and constitutional law, advanced by one of the persons to whom the crown would refer for legal advice. As, however, to the explanation so properly demanded ministers had equally properly given an answer, by declaring that the doctrines of their legal adviser were unconstitutional, there was no reason why the debate should not proceed. Sir C. Wetherell accordingly withdrew his motion.

Mr. Robert Grant, one of a small phalanx known as the friends and disciples of Mr. Canning, in whose creed resistance to what was called reform was a principal article, then spoke at great length in opposition to every thing which

his great leader had ever maintained. He hoped that the present measure, which had been anticipated by the country with anxiety, and received with avidity, would fulfil every reasonable expectation. He believed that those who spoke of moderate reform, meant well, so far as they were inclined to go; but he was sure that no great practical benefit would ever be derived from any reform which did not carry with it, as the present plan did, the affections of the people; and this willingness of the people to receive what was offered would tend in a great measure to obliterate many of those defects which the opposition had found, or supposed themselves to have found in the bill. That a House of Commons had been returned, speaking loudly the voice of the people, was no proof that the existing system was good. The present House had been formed under the influence of a royal and constitutional appeal to the people; under that stimulus the election had taken place; but what sort of a House would have been elected, if that stimulus had not been applied, was plain from the fact that, in the former parliament, the second reading had been carried by only an unit. The bill itself, so far from being a bill of innovation and revolution, was essentially a restorative and conservative measure. It had been repeatedly asked, can you produce a period when the House of Commons possessed more knowledge or greater independence than it did at the present moment? But there was another question, viz., had not a mighty change taken place in the constituency, and had the House of Commons kept pace with that change? Shew us, it was said,



the time when there were no close boroughs, and no nominees. But the nomination of members in earlier times was by the barons, who, before the Tudors, were really fighting the battles of the people, and the close boroughs were part of their means of offence and defence. A very efficient House of Commons, at one period, might be a very deficient one at another; for that was the best House of Commons which represented the actual state of public opinion at any given period. It had been urged, that not a single close borough had been added since the Revolution; but, he held that, just for that reason, the system must be bad. The change in the state of society had been so great, that, instead of the fact of the framework of the constitution continuing the same, proving that it must be right, he would conclude that it must, therefore, be unquestionably wrong. Considering how much the population, wealth, and intelligence of the country had increased since that period—how much velocity the improvement of mind had acquired—that full one-third of all that ought to be represented had sprung up since the Revolution, and that, in regard to representation, no more change had taken place, than if that mass of mind and improveable matter had never existed;—he must contend, that the so long continued system of representation could not be a just and perfect representation of the feelings of the community. Great as the quantity of unrepresented power had become, he would not go the length of maintaining that there was absolute danger in excluding it; yet, whoever watched the signs of the times, must be convinced, that it could not be

ultimately shut out, though it might be for this year or the next; while, by this bill, a power, so formidable, would be reduced to a safe and manageable force, for no great political power in a state could be safely subdued except by being conciliated. He denied, too, that a House of Commons, such as this bill was intended to create, would be mere puppets in the hands of their constituents, deprived of all independence of opinion, or power to act according to their own. The members would only be subjected to that due and proper degree of influence which constituents ought to exercise over their representatives. The effect of the measure would be, to introduce a greater infusion of the popular mind and feeling into the House—a thing which it much wanted; but it did not follow that members, on every occasion, would be obliged to act on the instructions of their constituents. They would only have to act on the declared wishes of their constituents, or to explain their reasons for differing from them.

Sir C. Wetherell could not but observe that, up to this closing discussion, ministers and their friends had been much more liberal of their votes than of their reasons; but now, when the bill was as good as passed, forth they all rushed, pouring out their penned up eloquence without mercy or consideration; and as logic, though an useful article, was not a shewy one, they could not be expected to encumber themselves with it in their triumphal parade. The population and commerce of the country, said Mr. Grant, and along with them its knowledge and intelligence, had mightily increased since the Revolution; and, therefore, as the un-



deniable conclusion from these premises, the number of representatives must be diminished—aye, and a House of Commons must be dissolved, too, because it thought that a good reason against diminution. For his own part, he beheld in the new system deformities as great as any that existed in the old; and, in proof of this, it was only necessary to refer to the boroughs of Calne, Tavistock, Horsham, Malton, and several other places, which, though undeniably as much nomination boroughs as any that had been totally disfranchised, and certainly not less capable of being purified by the creation of a new constituency than those which had been partially disfranchised, were allowed to retain all their privileges. Motives he would not impute; but he would state facts—and nothing would be a prouder testimony to the inference which men would draw from them, than ministers treating facts “with indignation and contempt”—the fact that every one of these boroughs, preserved in its privileges in defiance of the proscription of anomalies, was a nomination borough under the influence of persons whose interest it was *not* that his majesty’s ministers should lose their offices. Mr. Macauley had talked much of the opponents of the bill being infatuated men—altogether unendowed with the spirit of moderation, and, as always happened with men who were sure of only one thing upon earth, viz., that all who differed from them must be knaves or fools, he had tumbled into that forgetfulness of all facts which enabled rhetoricians to frame sentences untrammelled by the unreform-qualities of truth and reason. Had Mr. Macauley seen a pamphlet inti-

VOL. LXXIII.

tuled, “What will the Lords do.”\* Was it there that moderation was to be found? or was it in the newspapers? Had he read, within these two days, the language which had been held at a public meeting, where it had been said that, if the House of Lords should presume to throw out the bill, mutiny and treason were to be recommended to the country? When he talked of the moderation of the organs of the public voice, he must have shut his eyes—no, he was a member of the government, and must have read in the columns of a journal devoted to, and in the special confidence of, the government—a journal which arrogated to itself (he would not deny on just grounds) the lead of public opinion—a journal, moreover, to which it was notorious some of the most active spirits of the government contributed—he must have read in that journal, and that not in a small type paragraph, on a back page, but in a conspicuous column, in large Roman capitals, an article which was neither more nor less than an appeal to the soldiery to commit mutiny and treason. And if so, how could he talk of the moderation of the supporters of the Reform Bill? Had he also read those appeals in other journals, devoted to the cause of reform, in which certain hints were thrown out with respect to the innocent practice of setting fire to haggards and barns? Were these, forsooth, “moderate” opinions—calm and deliberate reflections on a great political question? Nor was this language confined to one or two of the exoteric friends

---

\* This pamphlet was universally believed to be the production of the lord chancellor Brougham.



of the periodical press, or to one or two of their disinterested friends either in that House or out of doors. Had they not read the speeches of their exoteric friends at some of those public meetings which their great organ, or rather their great dictator, *The Times*, had summoned into existence? Had not a member of that House, at one of those meetings, given utterance to expressions which had no other meaning than sweeping away the House of Lords, or putting it in a schedule A of a new reform bill? No doubt this language was just now indiscreet, on the part of a supporter of the bill—was a kind of letting the cat out of the bag before his time; and therefore its perpetrator's acquaintance would very judiciously be disclaimed by the noble lord (Althorp) opposite. But an enlightened public would not be deluded by the disavowal, and would feel what ministers must feel, that they were under the dominion of a despotic press, and that their acts were suicidal to themselves as a ministry, and must inevitably lead to that worst species of terrorism, the terrorism of the press. But Mr. Macauley had likewise told the peers of England to take a lesson from what had befallen the noblesse of France, and had drawn pictures of the dilapidated state of French noblemen's mansions, and of their rural chateaux, which would have done honour to the most perfect melo-dramatic abortion of the *Minerva* press, in order to impress upon the peerage of England the danger of not at once yielding, without deliberation, to the demands of the popular will. Take a lesson, said he, from that conduct and that fate, you English House of Lords, and yield in time, and with grace, to

the constitutional demands of the people. Were ministers aware that the parallel which their crack orator had attempted to draw between the English and the French peerage had no foundation? Was that eloquent gentleman himself acquainted with the facts on which he so glibly rung the changes? Certainly not, or he could not have overlooked the fact, that there was this striking difference between the English and the French peerage—that whereas the latter made no resistance to the demands of the people, and yielded every thing to the *tiers etat*, the House of Lords here had as yet expressed no opinion whatever, certainly not one on the side of concession. The French peers yielded every thing, and were extirpated root and branch, and yet the hon. member would induce the English barons to follow their fatal example. This, indeed, was logic and “friendly advice to the Lords” with a vengeance! But, added Mr. Macauley, it is a consolation to think, that the Lords have received from the ancient houses of Howard, and Talbot, and Stanley, an excellent example of yielding in time to the just demands of the people. Perhaps this was the case; but, certainly, so far as the bill enabled them to form an opinion, the fact appeared not so self-evident. For example, the ancient and populous borough of Tavistock, which belonged to the ancient and popular house of Bedford, was still to return two members, notwithstanding the Russell anxiety to purge itself of such an excrescence. Then there was the ancient and populous borough of Malton still to be encumbered with representatives, though its proprietor happened to be a member of an ancient reform family. In like



manner the ancient house of Petty was forced to retain its two members, no doubt to secure the talents of its present eloquent representative, though it was self-evident that the circumstance must make the heart bleed of the most noble marquis of Lansdowne. And, last of all, the illustrious head of the illustrious and princely house of Howard was still to be thwarted and pestered with nominating, for the good of the country, the members for the borough of Horsham. These, if put together, would make a very pretty schedule O to the bill—would make a very nice series of ciphers—a kind of algebraic negative quantities, and would be a very interesting subject of discussion for a reform parliament. Mr. Macauley, moreover, had talked much of the fatal folly of opposing the popular will, and, *per contra*, of the wisdom of timely yielding to it. But, if he referred to his own darling era of 1792, in the French revolution, he would see a man, a peer, a prince of the blood royal, courting, nay, worshipping mob popularity, by every means in his power, and yet whose ultimate, and certainly just reward—the usual reward of mobs—was having his head paraded on the top of a pike, amid the jeers of his once laudatory followers; and he deserved his doom. It was right to call on the peers of England to look at the fate of the French nobility, to teach them not to imitate, but to resist. It was now September, and the friends of this democratic bill would perhaps be proud of the title of Septembrizers. But if it was forthwith carried, as they seemed to expect, let them recollect how surely all history, and especially that history from which they lectured the Eng-

lish peers, taught them, that 1832 might see a race of Septembrizers exulting in doing a still more glorious work—in destroying the creation of 1831, and in making a newer constitution than the new constitution which it was now attempted to thrust upon the country.

Lord Althorp, who followed, admitted, in regard to the question whether this bill did not introduce a new constitution, that, if the House looked to the mere letter of the law, and to the mode of representation under the law, they could not find an instance of any such representation as was now proposed; but, if they looked to the principle on which ministers proposed to form a House of Commons representing the people, not merely in theory but also in fact, they would find that, in the best periods of our history, this principle was clearly established by law—that the House of Commons should represent the property, the wealth, the intelligence, and the industry of the country. Undoubtedly, the enactments, by which that object was effected in former times, were the same in principle as those now proposed; for, in former times, those boroughs, which returned members to parliament, did include all the wealth, all the intelligence, and all the property which then existed in the country. But now, when many of those boroughs had decayed—when large masses of wealth and property had risen in other parts of the country—when intelligence had extended to a much lower grade of society—when new voters had sprung up in that lower grade, possessing more information as to the principles of the constitution than the higher grade of society which used to vote



in those boroughs formerly possessed; when all this was the case, he contended that they were acting, if not in the letter, strictly in the spirit of the constitution, when they proposed to extend the elective franchise to the constituency formed by this bill. The arguments which had been used by many gentlemen in this debate, tended to prove that there was no use in representation at all. Those arguments were, that the constitution of that House contained a sample of every class in the community, and that every interest found a representative in that House. But did it follow, that because there were in the House samples of every class, and members of every interest, those persons were the representatives of the interests with which they were connected? If they were to ask an individual whether he would have his interest represented merely by a man of his class, or whether he would himself choose a representative for that class, he thought that the individual would reply, that he thought it preferable to be represented by a man of his own choice, than by a person who found his way into parliament through a borough over which he had no control. Even supposing the people to have formed extravagant and unfounded hopes of the good to be effected by this measure, would they not be less discontented when they had confidence in members elected by themselves, than they would be when represented by men over whom they had no control?

It had been assumed, continued his lordship, in the course of the debate, that by this bill they were going to establish a democracy, and entirely change the constitution. Now, the constitution of the

country would stand, after this bill, as it did at present, in all its relations with the country. It would still consist of King, Lords, and Commons; and as to the just influence of property and the aristocracy, there was nothing in that bill, or in any other bill, which could diminish that due influence. Undoubtedly it would spread that influence more over the body of proprietors than it was spread at present; for at present the influence of property over that House was only exercised by such proprietors as were also proprietors of close boroughs. By the bill it was proposed that the latter influence should be destroyed, and that the influence of property should be exercised by the mass of proprietors,—not by an oligarchy of them.

A multitude of members, he said, friendly to reform, had resisted the bill as going too far. But ministers thought, that if they did not give to the country an extensive plan of reform, they would only be making a change in the constitution of the legislature which would not give satisfaction. He had every reason to hope, from the satisfaction which it had already given, that the change which they had proposed would be permanent. He did not see that any of the grounds which had been stated in order to shew that it would not be permanent, were likely to raise discontent in the country. He did expect, that the bill would inspire the people with confidence in their representatives; and if so they would not call hereafter, as they had called lately, for a large and important change. Another objection urged against the general tendencies of the bill was, that, while it was founded on the increased wealth, population, and intelligence of the



country, the number of representatives was to be diminished. Now, he could not see why an increase in the number of elections should lead to an increase in the number of the elected. The real question was, would the number of members continued in Parliament by this bill be sufficient to perform the business of the country, extended as it was by the increase of its wealth and population. He should answer that question in the affirmative; but if he were obliged to answer it in the negative, a difficulty far greater would stare him in the face; for the only mode of increasing the number of members of the House beyond the number fixed by these bills would be by preserving some of the boroughs which the House had said ought no longer to send members to Parliament. It had been urged, too, that the bill still retained many cases of deformity, as, for instance, the boroughs of Calne, Horsham, and Tavistock. But the House ought not to look so much at the present as at the future state of constituency of these boroughs. The constituency of these towns would be altered, and the influence which now nominated the representatives for them, (for he did not mean to blink the fact that they were nomination boroughs), would be entirely changed. Of this he was confident, that the influence of the proprietors of these boroughs, if not entirely destroyed, would be materially diminished.

Lord Althorp fairly admitted that the bill, in its most important relation to the constitution, viz. its effect on the House of Lords, was an untried experiment. It had been urged, he said, that there was no instance in the history of mankind of a purely popular assembly

coexisting with a peerage and a monarchy: that was true; but he believed it was true only because the experiment had never been tried, and not because any rational man had ever thought that, if tried, it would not succeed. The experiment of a purely popular assembly had never been tried. Something like it had been attempted in this country, and the effects had been beneficial. They would be still more so, when the representation of that House was more correctly a representation of the wealth and intelligence of the country; and therefore he could not agree with the argument that, because that House was to be in future the real representative of the people, it would set about overturning all the institutions of the country, which in point of fact, existed only because the people were attached to them. The power of the House of Lords consisted, not in the physical force of its members, but in the attachment of the people; it consisted in public opinion, and when it was unsupported by public opinion, fall, he was afraid, it must. At present no one proposed to take from that House its share in legislation. Its influence depended, not only on its share of legislation, but on the knowledge of the people of the advantages they derived from having one branch of the legislature conservative and independent of popular commotion. The House of Lords was in no danger whilst it performed its duties, and therefore, if this bill passed, there was no danger of that House losing the influence which it always had possessed, and, he trusted, it always would possess, in the government of this country. The nobility of England had nothing to fear from



what had happened to the French noblesse. The latter had no doubt surrendered their exclusive privileges, but they did not make the surrender till after the revolution had commenced. There was danger in resisting the demands of the people at a right period, and granting them at a wrong one; for resistance at an early stage to just demands excited indignation, and concession at a late period gave rise to contempt.

Connected with the charge, that the bill would overturn the House of Lords, was another equally untenable objection, that it gave a preponderance to mere population collected within towns. On the contrary, it increased the county representation much more in proportion than the town representation. So far from being obnoxious to the charge of wishing to destroy the landed interests, ministers had exposed themselves to a reproach of an entirely different kind. The division of the counties was said to be a contrivance for adding to the influence of the landed proprietors. What ministers had really maintained was, that the division might possibly increase the influence of the landed interest; but the principal argument used by them was, that the power of the landed interest was really increased, not by the division of counties, but by doubling the number of the county representatives, who, whether elected by whole counties or by the divisions, would equally tend to increase the power of the landed interest. He did not think that the representatives of the landed interests were in danger of being diminished to such an extent as to render them powerless in that House. The case had been argued, as if, under the new system, no

person would be found to defend the landed interests except the county members, while one of the great objections made against ministers for producing this bill was, that they were about to localize representation. The representatives of the smaller towns would be country gentlemen; and therefore there was no reason to anticipate that the only influence of the landed interests in that House would be exercised through the medium of county members. Finally, said his lordship, now that we are arrived at the close of the discussion, if I were to give a description of the discussions which have taken place on this important measure, with respect to which the party feelings of gentlemen ran very high, I should say that they have been conducted with, comparatively speaking, very little personal violence. Undoubtedly, hard words have been used; and I think quite as much on the opposite side as on this. We have heard every epithet—but to quote violent expressions is not a good way to produce conciliation. I do not think that, upon the whole, gentlemen on either side have great right to complain of violent language. If there have been any violent expressions employed against the government, I am perfectly ready to forget them, and I hope and trust that gentlemen on the other side of the House will meet me in the same spirit of conciliation.”

Sir R. Peel followed, who, while he declined any discussion of the details of the bill, on which all that reason could do had already been expended, and cordially joined with lord Althorp in the hope that, if any angry expressions had been made use of in the course of the discussion, they would now be for-



gotten, could not but say that he had expected that, even at this eleventh hour, some member opposite would have informed the House what were the practical evils which this change in the constitution was intended to remedy. He had expected to hear a grave and statesmanlike discussion as to whether those evils were evils inherent in human institutions, and whether, if they were proved to exist, they really resulted from defects in the representation. In this expectation he had been disappointed. The House had had no proof offered it of the existence of such evils. In one single sentence lord Althorp had disposed of them, and proposed a most extraordinary change in the constitution. It was true, that his lordship left the House of Lords and the monarch as he found them; but what was it to the constitution, that the existence of a nominal authority was left to the Lords and the sovereign, unless it could be shown that they would also preserve that substantial authority which they had hitherto possessed in the government of the country? At what time in the history of any country, could it be shown that, when power was usurped either by an individual tyrant, or by a popular assembly, the specious form of old institutions was not permitted to exist. If ever there was a change which tended to increase democratic influence by positive addition on the one hand to that influence, and on the other by removing every check which had hitherto controlled that influence, it was the change which was now proposed. It was the greatest change that had ever been deliberately made in the constitution of any country, and from his conscience he believed made with the

least necessity. In the first place, this change far exceeded even the principle of the authors of it. If it were taken for granted that the time had arrived when nomination boroughs must be destroyed, and schedules A and B passed, still where was the necessity of altering the constituency of every county, city, and town in the united kingdom, and of altering the limits, or giving the power to alter the limits, of every place, however extensive, except from the desire of wanton change and innovation? He and his friends had laboured to mitigate its evils, and had failed, and he must do ministers themselves the justice to say that they also had laboured to mitigate its evils. They had tried to recede from their weekly tenancy. They knew the danger of it; but there was an extrinsic power greater than any which they could exercise, which controlled them in the first stage. Here, then, they gave this uniform right of voting through the country to the occupiers of 10*l.* houses, and by a strange perversion of reasoning they increased the popular influence where it was most dangerous. In large towns, where large bodies of men could be easily collected — where their feelings could be easily excited, — where the influence of the press was greatest, — in those places where there was the least necessity for the extension of the franchise, and the greatest danger, did they find out this class of weekly tenants, paying 3*s.* 10*d.* a week, and to these did they extend the franchise. But had they ever inquired in what estimation that class was held in the towns by the local administrators of the law, who must know them well, and who invariably refused to consider



them as responsible persons in cases where householders paying annual rent of 10*l.* by quarterly payments would be readily admitted? In Manchester so lightly did they hold weekly tenure, that the magistrates invariably refused the security of persons of this description.

While the bill gave a positive increase to democratic influence on the one hand, it removed, on the other, all those countervailing restraints from which mere democracy had received a salutary check. Corporation rights were to be no more. The representation of Scotland, which, whether capable of improvement or not, had been, for a century, an useful check upon popular feeling, was to be changed; and the Irish representation, on which was founded the security of property and of the established church, was likewise to disappear. More than all, the influence of the peerage in the House of Commons was to be destroyed. He would not say to what length such influence ought to go, but he mentioned its removal to show that, while the popular influence was increased, in the same proportion the checks, which had heretofore moderated its violence, were removed. But, in addition to this, it was that night, for the first time, avowed, and with menaces not to be mistaken, that if the Lords exercised their independent authority, and ventured to judge for themselves, they ran the risk of sealing their own doom. Did not this show the progress of—he would not say revolutionary opinions, for he did not wish to give offence by calling hard names—but did it not show the progress of opinion amongst men, when one of the sworn legal advisers of the Crown gave it as his deliberate opinion, that the

House of Commons was competent to act without the House of Lords, and that if the Lords should exercise their independent judgment and reject this bill, the House of Commons should advise the Crown to dissolve parliament, and to omit to send writs to any number of boroughs it should think fit, and that it was competent to the Crown to act on that advice? If this were so, where were the limits of the power? This doctrine, he admitted, was most candidly disavowed by government as unconstitutional, but the fact that it was avowed by any man in the situation of the member who maintained it, showed the change that had been brought about in opinions. The restraints, which the influence of the House of Lords, and of the Crown had, through that House, imposed upon the vehemence of public feeling, were thus all to be removed. And, looking at the attempts made to improve the government in other countries, and their complete failure, he was not prepared to make such a radical change as was now proposed without some better argument than any he had yet heard.

For what argument had the House yet heard but “the people will have it so?” Unless the House was convinced that what the people desired was for the national good, the fact that they desired it ought not to induce the House to concede it, for the moment they yielded implicitly to the commands of the people, that moment they resigned their character and functions as a deliberative body. It was easy to say, that the people would not desire any thing that was not for their own good, and it was unpopular to deny it; but he did deny it.



If he saw that men in their individual capacities, who spent their days in consulting their own interests, were always influenced by reason, and not by passion and feeling; if he saw the gambler and the speculator take reason for their guide, and not passion; if he saw that large bodies of men acting together were influenced by reason only, and not by passion or prejudice, and that when heated and excited, they were the best judges of their own interests;—then he might admit that a legislative body might not be wrong in yielding to the commands, on all occasions, of their constituents: but when he saw that the reverse of all this was the case, he must pause before he yielded to public feeling, solely because it was public feeling, and not founded on what he considered to be reason and justice. Then, forsooth, our present system was full of anomalies—nomination by peers was an anomaly. So be it. Suppose he were to tell a foreigner unacquainted with our laws, that cases sometimes of the most difficult and complicated nature were submitted to the decision of twelve men, selected indifferently, and that these men, if they did not agree at first, were to be starved into agreement, would he not think that a great anomaly? But would any man give it up on that ground, when he found that, on the whole, the system worked well? One of the greatest anomalies in the world was hereditary monarchy. Looking at it without any experience of its practical results, what could be a greater anomaly than to say, that in a nation, which possessed many able generals, an infant in its cradle should be the head of the state? Hereditary peerage was liable to a similar objection. But

experience had shown the great advantages of a hereditary monarchy and a body of hereditary senators. We should refer to the practical working of the thing, before we allowed ourselves to be influenced by the name of an anomaly, and before we gave up that which had hitherto worked so well. Many of those things which were called anomalies had so interwoven themselves with our habits and feelings, and even with the state of property in the country, that they were no longer looked upon as anomalies; but if he were to make choice of anomalies—and it was admitted that there were anomalies in the new constitution as well as in the old, in that which we were about to receive as well as in that which we were about to give up—he would prefer the ancient anomaly, that which had worked well for centuries to that of which he had yet no experience. “It may be prejudice,” said sir Robert, “but the people will view these venerable anomalies, as contrasted with those of to-day, with as much difference of respect as they would look upon the ancient peerages of the house of Russell or of Cavendish compared with my patent of nobility, if I were transferred to the House of Lords to support the reform bill.”

It had been fairly conceded, even by Mr. Macauley, that this bill would not work out for the people the blessings which they expected; that all it could give would be perfect freedom in the acquisition of property, and security in its enjoyment. But when was it discovered that these were wanting? He had never heard that any impediments were thrown in the way either of acquiring



property, or enjoying it with security. Or was it meant that the change was necessary to secure the triumph of free-trade? On the contrary, if London and Westminster were polled, the system of free-trade would be abolished, and the old system of restrictions restored. The present House of Commons had shown no indisposition to adopt the principles of free-trade. One of the measures which had been most earnestly recommended by the organ of liberalism (the "Edinburgh Review") was a free-trade in beer. The House of Commons resolved there should be a free-trade in that article, and the present ministers had introduced a measure to remedy the evils which had resulted from the liberality of the House. When the present government was formed, he certainly expected that some very enlightened system of jurisprudence would have been adopted—that all Mr. Bentham's suggestions would have been acted on—that penalties would have been abolished, and appeals made only to the feelings of mankind. But what was his astonishment to find that the only measure which ministers had proposed relative to the criminal laws was a revival of the law which allowed the setting of spring guns. Great complaints, too, were made of the taxes which had been imposed by an unreformed parliament. When the question of taxes was considered, it was necessary to look at the capability of the persons who had to pay them. Mr. Ricardo and sir Henry Parnell said, that England was less taxed than any other country in proportion to her means. Sir H. Parnell declared that the difficulties under which the country laboured were of a temporary nature.

Why, then, should he be called upon to consent to the proposed measure on the ground of the difficulties of the country and its great taxation? For these reasons he could not consent to the change which the bill proposed. He had nothing to do with any other measure of reform. He had none to propose himself. He opposed the bill, because it would effect too extensive a change. It was not making an addition to an existing structure to accommodate an increasing family, but uprooting all the foundations of an ancient edifice, and attempting to construct a new one. He did not believe that the new structure would be permanent. The arguments which were now adduced in favour of change would, in seasons of distress, be applied with equal force against the new system. The instruments of destruction had been employed with complete success against the constitution; but he would implore those who had used them, before they retired from the intrenchments from which their fatal attacks had been made, for God's sake! to spike their guns, and to remove from the sight of the future occupiers of those places every instrument of destruction by which the success had been obtained; for there was not one of them, from the highest to the lowest — from the twenty-four pounder to the smallest sparrow-shot—which might not be applied against the new system, which was to be created by the bill. He felt it his duty to continue, at the last stage of the bill, the opposition which he had offered to it at the commencement. He continued his opposition on precisely the same grounds, with no increased predilection for changing the constitu-



tion of his country. Popular opinion had been sufficiently demonstrated in favour of the measure to induce him to treat that opinion with the utmost respect, and to consider maturely whether he was justified in opposing it. He regretted to say, that his deliberative judgment was against the measure. He did not think that it would conduce to the permanent interests of the country. On that ground, and that ground only, and not for the purpose of maintaining the interests of peers or other persons, he felt himself bound to oppose the wishes of the people. "I cheerfully submit to pay the penalty to which that difference of opinion subjects me. With re-

luctance I surrender the hold which I may have on the people's esteem. That is a penalty which they have a right to inflict, but they have no right or power to compel me to acquiesce in their error—for I believe them to be in error. I will not involve myself in the responsibility of the measure, and being with others a life-renter only in the admirable constitution which has hitherto secured the peace and happiness of my country, I will not be instrumental in cutting off the inheritance of those who are to succeed me."

On the House dividing, the majority in favour of the motion for passing the bill was 109, the ayes being 345, and the noes 236.



## CHAP. IX.

*Reform Bill read a first time in the House of Lords—Threats of the Reformers against the Peers—Debate on the Second Reading of the Bill in the House of Lords—Speeches of Lords Grey, Wharncliffe, Winchilsea, Harrowby, the Duke of Wellington, Lord Eldon, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Lyndhurst, &c.—The Bill is thrown out by a Majority of forty-one—Motion carried in the House of Commons that Ministers ought not to resign,—Lord Howe dismissed from his office of Queen's Chamberlain, on account of his vote, and disclosures thereupon in the House of Commons—Attacks on the persons and houses of the Peers—Riots at Derby and Nottingham—Correspondence of Ministers with the Political Unions, and discussions thereon in the House of Commons—Financial statement—Prorogation of Parliament—Riots in Bristol—Formation of a National Political Union in London—Proposed general meeting of the Working Classes—Proclamation against Illegal Associations—Appearance of the Cholera Morbus in the North.*

THE reform bill having passed the Commons on the 21st of September, was carried up, next day, to the Lords, by lord John Russell, attended by about an hundred of its staunch supporters in the lower House. These gentlemen adopted the unusual mode of exciting the attention of the peers, and giving to the function which they were performing a striking and theatrical character, by accompanying the delivery of the bill to the lord chancellor with "hear, hear." A cry of "order," recalled them to a sense of the presence in which they stood. The bill was then read a first time, on the motion of earl Grey, without any remark being made, and was directed to be read a second time on the 3rd of October.

In the mean time the reformers out of doors had been vigorously employing all their engines to in-

timidate the peers into submission. It has been seen that the idea of their being bound to touch only with a delicate and trembling hand a bill which merely affected the constitution of the other House, had found its way into parliament. The language used by the political unions, by the press, and by the reformers, in their public meetings, was equally absurd, and infinitely violent. The peers, it was said, are merely trustees for the people; the latter are the persons beneficially interested in the trust which the former hold; and the peers, therefore, are not entitled to have an opinion of their own different from the will of those for whose benefit alone the trust exists; much less are they entitled to resist that will for the purpose of managing their trust in a way more conducive to their own particular interests than that which



the people has decided to be most desirable for the common good. But the language of plain intimidation was much more frequent than the language of even bad argument. The press called on the reformers to renew their meetings; the political unions again sent forth their addresses and petitions; the House of Lords were given plainly to understand, that they must pass the bill, if they wished to avoid being sacrificed amid convulsion and revolution; and the bishops, in particular, were warned against provoking the destruction of the whole establishment by shewing that its heads were the enemies of the public liberties. Every idea of the constitution was lost sight of. No reformer ever remembered that, in the eyes of the constitution, a measure to which the peers say no, is thereby as much ascertained to be an inexpedient measure, as if the negative had proceeded from the House of Commons. The House of Lords was treated as a body of mere delegates to confirm the deliberations of the Commons; all the multifarious forms of threat and abuse terminated in this, "you must pass this bill, however unjust and ruinous you may hold it to be, because it has already been passed by the House of Commons." Meetings were convened to warn the peers of "the tremendous consequences" of rejecting it, and to inform them how "deeply and fearfully the security of commercial as well as of all other property was involved" in passing it without delay. If the peers are bent on opposing the people, what, it was asked, will they gain by it? "Ninety-nine hundredths of the people will begin to look upon the power of the peers as a power

hostile to the nation, and the Tory peers may prepare themselves for speedy, as well as unambiguous demonstrations of the hold which such an impression has obtained on the minds of twenty-two millions of men." "In spite of all lovers of law, and all sticklers for constitutional forms, a question will arise, and men, aye, sober and honest citizens will ask it, shall we be without a constitution, or shall the Lords be made to do without those powers which enable them to deprive us of it?" "If the Lords reject or mutilate the bill, they are in effect, though indisputably not by design, guilty, first, of throwing the empire into confusion; secondly, of more than endangering their own existence." "The question, what will the Lords do? is one to be answered, not by the House of Lords, but by the people of England. What the Lords will do depends on the people. When they are publicly and unambiguously told, that which it seems they are unable to conjecture—the determination of the country that the bill shall pass—they will pass it." Such was the daily language of the press; and, of that which prevailed at the public meetings, the sentiments expressed in the common hall of London, may serve as a sample. There, one speaker said, "Should this bill, by any unforeseen possibility, be defeated, how did the noble conservators of rotten boroughs propose to retain their countrymen in allegiance to a defective political system? If it were to be negatived, would its foes answer for the existence of trade and the prosperity of the realm? Did they flatter themselves into the belief that they could induce the people to pay



taxes at the bidding of the reptiles in schedule A, and the *fiat* of the half-palsied schedule B, of which one part was dead while the other still maintained its vitality? The peers could not be insane, and he therefore presumed that it was their intention to pass it, rather than imperil their own existence by supporting a power as invidious as it was unjust—as dangerous to them as it was hateful to the people.” Another said, “The lords would assuredly pass the bill, if they were not actually smitten blind; they would pass it, as they hoped to transmit their honours to their children; they would pass it, if they desired to retain their rank and legitimate privileges; and they would moreover pass it without delay, for the public would not submit much longer to see trade at a stand-still, and business in a state of stagnation, on account of such tediously protracted expectation. If the lords rejected the bill, they would not be taken by surprise when they came to discover the unavoidable results. The people, he would forewarn their lordships, would not thenceforward pay taxes, nor would they be justified in doing so, when the country had decided that the constitution was not what it ought to be.” “Let the lords,” said colonel Torrens, “refuse this bill, if they dare; and if they do, dearly will they rue their obstinacy hereafter. You all remember the sibyl’s story. She presented her oracles to Tarquin and his court, and her oracles were rejected. She burned a portion, and again offered them, but they were again rejected. After diminishing their number still further, she once more returned, and the remaining volumes were gladly purchased at

the price which she had originally demanded for the entire. We, however, mean to reverse the moral, for should the present bill be defeated, we shall bring their lordships another bill demanding a little more, and then, should they still dare to resist the might, and insult the majesty of the people of England, which Heaven forbid! united as one man will we come forward with a bill of reform, in which their lordships will find themselves inserted in schedule A.” And these sentiments were received with loud applause. In their enthusiasm, the reformers seemed entirely to forget, that such a constraint upon the peers was as effectual, and a far more degrading, abolition of the House of Lords, than a formal declaration that it should no longer assemble. Still less did they see, that they were excluding from the legislature the largest portion of the real property of the country. The peers were to have no indirect influence in the deliberations of the Commons, and now they were to have no deliberate voice even in their own house.

Amid these violent remarks, earl Grey moved, on Monday, the 3rd of October, the second reading of the bill.

After some prefatory observations, he said that, being called to form a new administration, he stated candidly to his majesty, that the only condition on which he would accept office was, that he should bring forward the question of parliamentary reform as a measure of government. That condition was sanctioned by the monarch, assented to by the Commons, and received with unmixed satisfaction by the great body of the people. “I lost,” said he, “no time in



framing, in conjunction with my colleagues, a measure, the result of which forms the subject of this night's deliberation. There is nothing in this measure which is not founded on the acknowledged principles of the constitution, and which may not be adopted with perfect safety to all the interests and orders of the state, and more particularly to that order to which we, as members of this House, belong. A measure of a partial and limited nature would satisfy no party. The best measure to be adopted was a bold one—one which should, upon reasonable terms, satisfy the general desire, and place in a strong position the true principle of reform. In this view of the case it was impossible not to look at the state of what were called nomination boroughs, against which, in particular, the public feeling was directed. We first proceeded to consider what were the boroughs that ought to be abolished. As most of them retained nothing except their ancient sites, they appeared only as a gangrene in the frame of the constitution, defying every method of cure, except excision. It was therefore determined that the whole of them should be disfranchised, and placed in schedule A. We further proposed that the census of 1821 should be taken, as that best calculated to answer the object in view. We found another class of boroughs of a higher qualification, and to these we thought it advisable to continue the representation on a modified scale, their constituency being enlarged, but their representation diminished. Some may argue that a diminished representation is inconsistent with the principle upon which we profess to act, but our object has been

to make as little change as possible, since every change, except what is inevitable, ought to be avoided. The next question was, how the vacant seats were to be supplied? and it was proposed that, in the first place, sixty-five additional members should be given to the counties—in the next, that twenty-four members should be returned by twelve large towns, which should have two each; and twenty-eight representatives by the twenty-eight towns next in rank and population. These, with one additional member for Wales, would leave a diminution for England and Wales of thirty-six members. The plan was, after having removed the decayed branches, to cause new shoots to spring forth, and to restore health and vigour to the body of the tree."

His lordship then went into the minuter details of the bill, in explaining which he stated, that he did not approve of the extension of the franchise for counties to tenants not having leases: his objection to that provision was, that if landlords should exercise the power they would thus acquire in such a way as it had been exercised in some places, it might produce a general demand throughout the country for a regulation to which he was opposed, and in favour of which there was not one petition on their lordships' table—the vote by ballot.

He then proceeded to argue, that the system of nomination not only was no part of the British constitution, but was absurdly inconsistent with its acknowledged principles. In every session it was a standing order that the interference of peers in the elections of members of parliament was uncon-



stitutional ; there was a statute of the realm declaring that no taxes were to be levied on the people, except such as were imposed by their representatives ;—and the House of Commons was so jealous of its privileges in this respect, that it would not suffer the interference of the lords to correct the most trifling mistake. Such was the principle of the constitution. As to the practice, was it not the fact that it had ever been the prerogative of the Crown to summon members to parliament for such towns as it deemed competent to the power of election ? How, then, could it be said, that to do away with decayed boroughs was a course unknown to the constitution ? The disfranchisement of certain boroughs had been described as spoliation and robbery. But the right to send representatives to parliament was a trust, and there could be no greater mistake than to confound the obligation of a trust with the right of property. A trust is ever confided upon certain conditions, and may be resumed if they be broken. There was no lapse of time, no prescription of abuse, which could convert that which was originally a trust for the people into a property. But if the resumption of a trust after manifest abuse, was an act of spoliation, had it not taken place over and over again ? There are now forty-four boroughs and one city, which formerly sent representatives to parliament, but which, in consequence of the discontinuance of the writs, do not now send members. This was disfranchisement nearly equal in amount to that of schedule A, and effected by the ordinary process of the constitution. The Union with Scotland reduced the repre-

sentatives of boroughs in Scotland from sixty-five to fifteen ; and the Irish Union struck off at one blow 100 boroughs, returning 200 members. Was this spoliation and robbery ? Oh ! but compensation was given, and interests in those boroughs were thus treated as a right of property. That compensation was scandalous bribery and corruption ; but twenty-eight of these boroughs were struck off without compensation. The disfranchisement of the boroughs in schedule A, therefore, was merely the exercise of a constitutional power, in the resumption of a trust which was no longer beneficially exercised. The system, it was said, had worked well ; and were we to do away with that under which the country had attained its present high degree of power and prosperity ? It had not the confidence of the people, and if that were most essential to the support of every government, then so far from working well, the system had worked very ill.

Earl Grey next proceeded to consider how far the system of nomination boroughs contributed to the real weight and influence of the House of Lords. In the first place, said he, it is to be considered that the power of nominating members to sit in parliament is not enjoyed by this House in general, by your lordships as a body in the state ; but by a few wealthy individuals amongst you, who exercise the power for their own separate interests. The power, therefore, is exercised and enjoyed only by a few, whilst the odium falls upon the whole body : so that, by getting rid of the system, you remove the odium ; and the peerage, as a body, loses nothing. Then the power of nomination is liable to



continual transfer and change. It may leave your lordships' hands altogether, or it may accumulate in an individual to such an extent, as to be not only odious to the country but inconvenient to the government, by rendering it, in a great degree, dependent upon the person who possesses this power. Though I am the last man to propose to retain the influence which enables any member in this House to interfere in the elections of members of the House of Commons—an interference that cannot be too strongly condemned, yet do I propose that your lordships should be deprived of any part of your legitimate power or influence? God forbid! The respect due to your rank, and the influence which, from property, you necessarily possess, will belong to you after the passing of the bill as fully and in as great a degree as they now do. The odious power which is possessed by some of you does not help to increase that legitimate influence; but if you resolve to maintain the nomination boroughs, the whole voice of the united kingdom will be raised against you. You are asked only to give up that which is odious, unjust, and unconstitutional, and by retaining which the security of this House may be shaken. The influence which your lordships possess, in the representation of sixty-five old boroughs, may be taken from you by this bill; but the peers and the landed interest are not thereby deprived of their influence in the representation: on the contrary, that influence is increased."

He next contended, that this measure had received the approbation of the country. He was one of the last men in that House

who would grant any thing to intimidation. He would say "Resist popular violence—do not give way to popular commotion!" But here there was no violence, there was no commotion. The opinion of the people was, however, fairly and unequivocally expressed; no government could turn a deaf ear to it, and least of all could a government founded on free principles take such a step. He flung aside all idea of menace and also intimidation; but he conjured them, as they valued their rights and privileges, and wished to transmit them unimpaired to their posterity, to consider well, before they came to a decision on this question—with reference to which nine-tenths of the people had expressed their opinion in a tone too loud not to be heard, and too decisive to be misunderstood. Let not their lordships think that, if this measure were rejected, a more mitigated and less comprehensive one might be substituted in its place with safety. The time was passed for taking half-measures. They must either adopt this bill, or they would have, instead of it, something infinitely stronger and more extensive. The measure thus brought forward in the first instance at the recommendation of the Crown—(Cries of order from Lord Wynford and several other noble lords)—He was not aware that he had said any thing out of order: he had alluded to the speech from the throne, and to which he was perfectly justified in alluding, as a matter on the journals of the House. He would speak of it, then, not as the recommendation of the Crown, but as the speech from the throne; and though he admitted that even in this sense it must be considered as the produc-



tion of ministers, yet still it was not to be supposed that it would be delivered by the Sovereign, unless it had previously received the sanction of his private opinion. The measure was one which had been carried by an overwhelming majority of the other House; it was supported by the prayers of millions who respectfully knocked at their lordships' door, and asked for that which they considered to be the restoration of their just rights. Were their lordships prepared to reject a bill so supported, and that, too, on its second reading? He did not believe, that the rejection of the bill would be productive of a civil war: still he could not conceal his apprehension that the result of its rejection would be most dangerous to the best interests of the country. He would venture for a moment to address himself to one part of their lordships' house, the right rev. prelates on the benches near him; and while he assured that body, that no man was more sincerely attached than he was to the maintenance of all the rights and privileges of the church,—no man held in higher veneration the purity of its doctrines and discipline,—no man was more ready to admit the zeal, and learning, and piety of those who presided over it,—let him at the same time respectfully enreat those right rev. prelates to consider, that if this bill should be rejected by a narrow majority of the lay peers, and if its fate should thus, within a few votes, be decided by the votes of the heads of the church, what would then be their situation with the country? Those right rev. prelates had shown that they were not indifferent or inattentive to the signs of the times. They had intro-

duced measures for effecting some salutary reforms in matters relating to the temporalities of the church, and in this they acted with wise forethought. Let them, he implored, now follow up the same prudent course. The eyes of the country were now upon them. He called upon them to *set their house in order*, and prepare to meet the coming storm,—to consider seriously what would be the opinion of the country should a measure, on which the nation had fixed its hope, be defeated by their votes. They were the ministers of peace: earnestly did he hope, that the result of their votes would be such as might tend to the tranquillity, peace, and happiness of the country. As regarded the whole of their lordships, spiritual and temporal, he hoped that the consequences of the rejection of the bill would be seriously considered, for its consequences could be no other than serious. As to the effect which the rejection or adoption of the measure might produce to him, or the administration of which he formed a part, it was not necessary for him to say much, for that was perhaps a matter of insignificance. He would only say, that by this measure he was prepared to stand or fall. The question of his continuance in office for one hour would depend on the prospect of being able to carry through that which he considered so important to the tranquillity, the safety, and the happiness of the country.

Lord Wharncliffe next addressed the House. He defended nomination, not because it was made by peers or other influential individuals, but because its effect in the House of Commons was, that



it acted as a check on those places which were popularly represented. It prevented the ebullitions of popular feeling from having too great an influence on the decisions of a deliberative body, and saved it from being merely an assembly of delegates, sent only to express the opinions of the people as they dictated from without. The nomination might in itself be irregular, but had not the whole system worked in that way which made it worth preserving? One party, and that by no means a small one, supported this measure, because they considered that, if it were carried, it would in a short time be impossible to stop the torrent of popular opinion. These men anticipated, that by this bill the power of the House of Lords would be given up to them; already did they exult in its fancied result; and, to use the words of Cromwell, when speaking of his enemies at the battle of Dunbar, they said, "The Lord has delivered you into our hands. If you pass this bill, you at once part with all your power." This measure was one of the greatest delusions ever practised on the public,—a measure more full of anomalies than any that had ever before been introduced into parliament. The bill, in order to captivate certain classes of persons who constituted the great body of people within the large towns, gave the elective franchise to 10*l*. householders. But this qualification was much too low, and he was sure that the noble lord opposite, and the hon. gentlemen who had first introduced this plan of reform, had got frightened at this monster of their own creation. Everybody recollected how the qualification was changed from a rent of 10*l*. merely, to a rent of

10*l*. reserved on leases payable half-yearly. A powerful press was looking on every operation connected with this bill; and as soon as this alteration was perceived by it, a loud demand was raised that it should be withdrawn. The authors of it immediately saw the dilemma in which they had involved themselves, and became most anxious to be extricated from it. It was therefore said, that the alteration was an inadvertence. Was he to be told that a government, which was making the most important changes ever proposed in any constitution, was acting on inadvertence? It was their duty to have considered minutely, not only every clause, but every word and every letter of every clause in the bill. He next objected to the number of great towns to which this bill gave the privilege of having representatives. That showed that the principle of the bill was not property, but population. It was impossible for any man who saw the great wealth embarked in the manufactures of the country, and the great interest which the manufacturing towns had in the proper expenditure of the state, to deny that those towns were entitled to have some share in the representation of the state; but it was a very different thing to give every town with a population of 15,000 inhabitants the privilege of returning members to parliament. In the county of Lancaster, and in the west riding of the county of Yorkshire, for instance, there were certain trades and manufactures confined to certain towns only. Admitting, however, that the noble earl was acting on a fair principle, he was bound to give to the landed interest something to balance the pressure of



the towns ; and, in this respect, the bill was likely to prove a delusion on the landed proprietors. If ministers had really wished to balance the representation of towns, they ought to have sought the means of obtaining that balance not in those counties where the manufacturing interest preponderated, but in those counties where the agricultural interest predominated. No one could as yet tell what would be the effect of giving additional members to the different counties. For, in the first instance, the bill did not give these additional members to the counties directly : it enacted that the counties should be divided, and ministers had sent down commissioners to divide them. The commissioners had already begun their labours, although, in point of fact, the bill which called them into existence had not yet been read a second time in their lordships' House. He must know something of the proceedings of these commissioners, before he could pretend to speak decisively of the influence which the new county representatives would exercise in the other House of parliament. He must know how the counties were to be divided, before he could know any thing of the influence which would predominate in the different districts. Thus, if in Staffordshire the line were drawn, where it most naturally would be drawn, the four members for that county would be returned by one class of the population alone. Again, in Warwickshire the division might be so made, as to place the representation entirely in the hands of the manufacturing interest. Then came the provisions as to the increase of voters for the representatives of counties. First,

the copyholders were taken in ; then the leaseholders ; then, last of all, the tenants at will. In his opinion, this last addition to the county constituency was any thing but an improvement. *Prima facie*, it gave an appearance of weight to the landed proprietary ; but connected with the 10*l.* qualification clause, it would place a great number of the new-made voters entirely at the mercy of their landlords ; and the exercise of such a power on the part of the landlords would lead almost instantly to the vote by ballot. It was impossible that this bill should be a final settlement of the reform question. Ministers had already opened a door to the demands of the people, —they had told the people that they were entitled to a full, fair, and free representation in parliament ; and the people would insist on having that representation in perfect conformity with the ideas which they entertained of a full, fair, and free representation. These were some of his principal objections to the bill. Many persons had voted for the second reading in the House of Commons in the hope of amending it afterwards in committee ; but every person who had the slightest experience in parliament was well aware that, when a bill brought in by government was read a second time, it was a matter of extreme difficulty to make any alterations in it in committee. He thought that this bill was dangerous in the extreme —and that in spite of all the petitions which had been sent up in favour of it, the people were deluded and not satisfied by it. The noble earl had told their lordships to look at the petitions which were now coming up to them every day from the country.



He had looked at them; he had looked at them with respect; and his view of these petitions was, that their object was not so much this bill of reform as reform of some description or other. Their cry was, "We must have parliament reformed;" but it was not, "We must have parliament reformed by this bill." The feelings of the people were changed with regard to this bill, and their meetings no longer retained the character which they lately bore. There was a certain portion of the press which still trumpeted forth these meetings as an expression of the feelings of the people; and yet those who had got them up were perfectly ashamed of the manner in which they had turned out. If a House of Commons, he further argued, were once elected on the principles of this bill, it would inevitably cramp the Crown in the exercise of its prerogatives, and create a body in the House of Commons so irresistible as to make the decisions of their lordships on all public questions nugatory. Hitherto, when any man had been chosen minister, he must have been, previous to that choice, a member of parliament. Now if he should have to stand, in the borough or county which he represented, the expense of a contested election, and if he should be unable to bear the expense of that contest, or if he should happen to be unpopular, he would then have no means of getting into parliament through a nomination borough; and if so, he would have some difficulty in finding his way into parliament at all. As members of the House of Peers, their lordships might not feel personally interested in such a matter; for they might think that in that case the ministers of

the Crown must in future be all peers. He was, however, convinced, from long experience in public affairs, that the business of the country could not be well transacted, unless the ministers had seats in the House of Commons. He would further say, that this House of Commons would become too much the image of the people. The danger which at this moment surrounded their lordships proved the accuracy of his position. They had now a popular House of Commons—a delegate House of Commons. That House had passed this measure, and their lordships were now told that nothing was left for them to do but to record and register the decree of the Commons. He concluded by moving that "this bill be rejected."

After lord Mulgrave had spoken in support of the bill, and lord Mansfield against it, Lord Wharncliffe rose to vary the form of his amendment. He had just been informed that, as it then stood, his amendment might possibly be interpreted as an affront to the House of Commons. Nothing could be farther from his intentions and wishes, and he therefore begged leave to withdraw it, and to propose in its stead that the bill be read a second time that day six months. Lord Holland felt it would be improper for their lordships to assent to this proposition. Lord Wharncliffe repeated that, so far was he from wishing or intending to show any disrespect to the House of Commons, that he would not divide the House upon his amendment, and therefore in courtesy he hoped he should be permitted to withdraw it in its present form. Lord Holland and lord Plunket would not ac-



cede to the withdrawal. Lord Grey was desirous that it should be recorded on the journals that a bill sent up by the House of Commons had been met with the most unusual and harsh, and most extraordinary motion of an unqualified rejection. But, at last, after some discussion, lord Wharncliffe was permitted to withdraw his amendment and to move that the bill be read a second time that day six months.

The debate was resumed on the 4th of October by lord Winchelsea, who opposed the bill. He was of opinion that the influence, which some individuals exercised through the means of the decayed boroughs, was a great evil; that representatives ought to be given to the principal manufacturing towns, and additional representatives to the larger and more important counties. To accomplish these latter purposes he was ready to agree to the disfranchisement of boroughs, which had neither houses nor inhabitants, but he was not prepared to assent to the sweeping extinction which was to be effected by schedule A. A more judicious course would have been to have allowed many of the places included in it to retain one member, and to have created a sufficient constituency by extending the franchise to the adjacent parish or hundred. He objected to many of the details of the measure, especially to the provision for conferring members on various districts in and about the metropolis; and he was convinced that it would give to the popular power, an undue preponderance which would be fatal to the equilibrium of the constitution.

The present bill, said lord Harrowby, would throw aside a

constitution which had proved beneficial, and adopt theoretical views as a substitute. The people fancied there existed bad government. This was impossible; good government produced prosperity and the country was prosperous. The noble lord contended that the bill was too democratic, and had misled the people, who expected from it cheap bread, and a repeal of the taxes. If the taxes were repealed to the extent desired, it must be at the cost of the honour and credit of the country. It was argued that, if the parliament was reformed, we should not have war; but in truth democratic governments were the most warlike, and the wars in which the country had been engaged were carried on by the wishes of the people. He was willing to diminish the number of inconsiderable places which sent members to parliament; and he believed it was desirable to give representatives to large towns. Though all interests were efficiently represented in parliament, as now constituted, a change of some sort was necessary to ensure attachment to the government: but a reasonable method ought to be adopted to secure such attachment, and not the proposed measure. The whole of the bill was founded upon such a principle that it was impossible that their lordships could pass it. He had tried to mend it and found it impossible. The principle of population was not the true basis upon which representation ought to be established. The lines drawn in the boroughs and towns were liable to much objection, and the greatest anomalies existed in the bill. The existing constitution was not established upon any one particular principle, but was created by



circumstances and the wants of the people at various periods. A balance ought to exist between the agricultural and manufacturing interest, and those interests were equally and fairly represented by the present system. He objected also to the enormous numbers of voters which were created by the bill. In no country did such a number of votes exist as in this country at present. In France, with a population of thirty-two millions, there were only 200,000 voters. In England, with a population of twelve millions, the bill created one million of electors: one class of voters alone would govern the whole elections, and it was easy to know what class of persons would be elected, where the qualification was brought down to 3s. 6d. per week. Lord Harrowby concluded by stating that, when he found that the administration of the Duke of Wellington could not stand, he hailed with satisfaction the calling of lord Grey to the councils of the state, because he looked not to Mr. Grey, but to lord Grey, and he had hoped that he should have been able to support him. Had the noble lord steered a middle course, he would have had the support of all those who were favourable to a measure of reform. But what was the use of supporting the second reading of this bill with a view to its being amended in the committee? The other House said, that they would admit amendments which did not interfere with the general principle of the bill. But how did they keep their promise? They might talk of bribery and corruption, but never was there any thing experienced equal to the bribery thrown out by this bill to at least

500,000 persons. He contended that the majority of the people knew nothing of what this bill would do; they supported it because they believed it would give them cheap food. And he also contended that both Houses of parliament were there to legislate upon measures brought before them, and not to be led away by the popular cry to pass this or that measure. It was asked what did they expect from opposing this measure? Why, there was always something to be got by deciding honestly. But there was another object in this opposition; it would give the other House and the country an opportunity of more fully considering this measure of reform.

Lord Melbourne supported the bill. The duke of Wellington, after some introductory remarks, referred to the language in which lord Grey had spoken of the House of Commons in February, 1817. 'Constituted as it now is,' said lord Grey at that time, 'he in his conscience, believed, that the House of Commons was, of all institutions, in all countries in the world, the best calculated for the general protection of the subject.' In 1830 he the duke of Wellington, had pronounced an opinion in parliament, on the subject of reform, of which the noble earl had pronounced his disapprobation. What he said on that occasion, was, that he approved of the constitution of parliament; and if he were to invent a constitution for parliament over again, he would not say, that he would adopt the same as it now existed, because the invention of man could not accomplish it, but he would endeavour to frame one like it, in



which property should preponderate. He had made this statement as a minister of the Crown; and as a minister of the Crown he conceived that he was bound to resist all projects of parliamentary reform. The noble earl had said, that it was this sentence, delivered by him, which had created that spirit of reform which now pervaded the whole country. Not so: that spirit of reform had originated last year with the French revolution. Ever since the American war, the minds of the people of this country had been occasionally disturbed by this spirit of reform. When any insurrection grew up in Europe, a desire of reform was exhibited in England. But he thought that, for some years past, there had been fewer manifestations of any desire for reform, previous to the French revolution in July 1830, than in former periods. Unhappily two days after the issue of the ordinances of Paris, his majesty dissolved the parliament in a speech from the throne in that House: and the elections were, no doubt, conducted with a stronger spirit of parliamentary reform, and several candidates who refused to give a pledge upon that question lost their seats. But, neither what occurred in parliament in November, 1830, nor what had happened afterwards respecting his majesty's visit to the city, was at all attributable to the question of parliamentary reform. As to what occurred in London, as far as he was concerned, he had spoken, on the 2nd of November, the words referred to; he had placed certain papers in the king's hands, on Friday, the 5th, and received his majesty's commands on Sunday, the 7th; therefore to attribute to

him, or to the subject of parliamentary reform, merely as parliamentary reform, the effects ascribed to them, was inconsistent with facts. The state of the public mind in London, and generally throughout the country, both in the south and in the north of England, was to be attributed to the French revolution and that of Belgium, and not to the question of reform. The noble earl had thought proper to blame him and his colleagues for having written to the lord mayor the letter in which his majesty declined his promised visit to the city. But he begged to know why his majesty had not yet gone to the city? Were he and his colleagues right or wrong in what they did on that occasion? The noble lord at the head of the home department had papers which would enable him to judge whether the late ministers had been right or wrong in the advice they had given his majesty. If they were wrong, he should like to know why his majesty had not yet been to visit his loyal citizens? It was plain, then, that the dissolution of the late government had nothing to do with the question of parliamentary reform. "We retired," said he, "not because we did not declare ourselves advocates of reform, but because we had lost the confidence of the House of Commons." The noble earl was called upon to form an administration; and it was important to bear in mind, that when he first announced to their lordships that he had obtained his majesty's permission to propose a plan of reform as a government measure, he stated that "he wished to stand as much as he could upon the fixed and settled institutions of the country;



feeling that some reform was necessary, the principle on which he wished to regulate it—for the task, he believed, would on all sides be considered as one of no small difficulty—would be that of doing as much as was necessary to secure to the people a due influence in that council in which they were nominally considered to be peculiarly represented, and of restoring by that means a satisfaction and confidence in the determinations of parliament, without which the government could not long proceed in comfort and safety. A reform, extensive to this degree—and if it were not extensive to this degree, it would be inefficient, he wished to see adopted; limited, however, by a due regard to the settled institutions of the country, and not accompanied by those great and sudden changes, which must produce their disturbance, if not their destruction.” The question was, then, whether the noble earl had adhered to these his solemn declarations—whether the present bill was founded on the principles and practice of the constitution? He (the Duke of W.) answered, No. For the bill violated both the principles and practice of the constitution. It went to establish a new system of representation in every county, borough, and town in the united kingdom, with the exception of the two universities. The town representation would be placed in the hands of close, self-elected committees, like that which had appointed itself in the metropolis at the close of the last session, and which dissolved itself only in consequence of the notice which its proceedings had attracted in parliament. The undue enlargement of the powers of the town constituency would entirely destroy the

balance of the agricultural representation of the counties, which, even under the existing system, was not quite equal to what the national interests required. The towns already exercised an extraordinary influence in the election of the county representatives: and the evil would be aggravated tenfold by the clause of the bill which gave votes to leaseholders and copyholders. He could not say how the measure would affect the representation of Scotland: but he could not forget the emphatic declaration of the late lord Liverpool, that no country was better governed, or had advanced more in commerce, wealth, intelligence, and prosperity, than Scotland, within the last sixty or seventy years. And yet the system which had produced these admirable results was, forsooth, about to be done away with, to make room for one wholly alien to the habits of the Scotch people, and which, as in England, would give the town constituency a preponderating influence in county elections. Then in Ireland, of which he could speak with more confidence, the schemes of ministers would effect changes which were still more extensive. He and the supporters of the Catholic relief bill had vainly supposed, some two years ago, that they had settled for ever the question of political collision between the Catholic and Protestant inhabitants of that country. But the bill, by giving a vote to all leaseholders of a certain rate in counties, and every 10*l.* town householder, would place the whole elective power in the hands of the Catholics. The bill, besides, would do away with the system of non-resident freemen. In Ireland, this provision would be fatal to the Protestant influ-



ence in the twelve close corporations which had been established there in the time of James I, for the security of the Protestant establishments in church and state. At present the members of those corporations were generally Protestants and non-resident; and it was plain that if the inhabitants, chiefly Catholics, were entitled to vote, and the franchise of the non-residents were abolished, the constituency must fall into the hands of the Catholics. This grievance would be particularly felt by the corporations of towns, which were counties in themselves; because when they, on the passing of the Catholic relief bill, pressed for the abolition of the 40s. freeholders, in these towns as well as in counties, they were told there was no occasion, as they had and would retain the power of adding *ad libitum* to the number of their non-resident freemen. In Ireland, as in Scotland and England, the constituency would be essentially democratic, and their representatives would be a fierce and violent democratic assembly. How was a constitutional government to manage such a body? How, for example, could ministers refuse to bestow members on the great unrepresented towns omitted in schedules C and D? If some towns were to return two members merely because their population happened to be something above 4,000, how would they refuse a town with 30,000 or 40,000 inhabitants at least one representative? And if the principle of population and numbers were once adopted, must not a sweeping, violent, levelling democracy be the result? "No," say ministers, "there is no fear of a democracy, because the people of this country are unalterably at-

tached to the constitution of King, Lords, and Commons." If so, then, he would ask, why hesitate to go the full length of popular reform, and grant at once universal suffrage and annual parliaments? If ministers had such trust in the rooted affections of the people for a limited monarchy, with Lords and Commons, why not trust them with a still more extensive system of suffrage? He should like to know how the king could exercise his constitutional prerogative of choosing his own ministers in a House of Commons constituted as all future houses must be under the bill? The king was the head of all the civil and religious establishments of the state, and no political appointment could be made, or tax expended, but by his mandate. How could the king freely exercise these prerogatives, if parliament were the mere creature of the people's will, and ministers wholly dependent upon its favour for the means of carrying on the government? He would contend that the government of the country must possess a certain degree of influence in the House of Commons, in order to conduct and carry on the administration of public affairs. The mere confidence and support of its friends would not do. The executive government must possess the means, the power, of carrying its determinations into effect. Instances occurred every week, even with the House of Commons which had been chosen under the existing system, in which that influence was manifestly required. If this question should be carried, a discussion would follow quickly with regard to the existence of the church of England in Ireland. That church in Ireland



they were bound to maintain by the articles of the union between the two countries. When they should have 105 members returned to parliament by the Roman Catholic hierarchy—did the noble lord imagine that under such circumstances, it would be possible to find any means to enable the king to maintain the church of England in that country? Who were the persons, he would ask, who already made constant attacks on the church—who carried on a description of opposition in parliament, which occasioned serious difficulties to the present government? Why, the very members who sat in parliament for large towns and popular counties in Ireland, and who had been returned by that particular influence to which he had called their lordships' attention. He would ask the noble earl (Grey) whether he had not already, in the course of the present session of parliament, felt some inconvenience from the communications which he had had with those Irish members who had in a certain degree erected themselves into a distinct and independent body? Was it not true, that the secretary for Ireland, in the House of Commons, was under the necessity, even in the present state of parliament, of yielding to the particular influence of these men, and of abandoning a measure which he had brought forward connected with the government of Ireland? If this measure should be carried, the influence to which he had referred would become so predominant in the House of Commons, that it would render the conduct of the government of the country absolutely impossible; and force, or something like it, would be necessary

to carry the ordinary operations of the executive into effect. A small step taken in this matter could never be retraced. In taking a single step they might go too far, but, if they once took that step, they must proceed in a course, which, after exposing them to all the horrors of a democratic revolution, would most probably terminate in the establishment of a military despotism, with all the evils attendant upon that system of government. There was no country in the universe in which so much happiness, so much prosperity, and so much comfort were diffused amongst all the various classes of society; none in which so many and such large properties, both public and private, were to be found as in England. Such was the condition of this country under that system which was now so greatly condemned. We enjoyed, under that system, the largest commerce, and the most flourishing colonies in the world. There was not a position in Europe in any degree important for military purposes, or advantageous for trade, which was not under our control, or within our reach. All those great and numerous advantages we possessed under the existing system; but it would be impossible that we should any longer retain them, if we once established a wild democracy, a complete democratic assembly, under the name of a House of Commons.

On the two following evenings, lord Dudley and Ward, lord Haddington, and lord Carnarvon, were the principal speakers against the bill; and lord Lansdowne, lord Goderich, and lord Plunkett, in its favour.

On the fifth and last night of the debate the discussion was be-



gun by lord Wynford. He was followed by lord Eldon, who condemned the measure as subversive of the rights of property as well as of the monarchy, and of every principle acknowledged by the constitution. "When we come," said the venerable peer, "to a sweeping disfranchisement, without knowing whether any or all of these boroughs have been guilty of mal-administration, give me leave to ask, what security is there for property of any description? Are there no corporations in the country but close corporations? Are not corporations as well entitled to the privileges which they hold by charters under the Great Seal of England, as your lordships are to your peerages? Has it ever been heard of, or will it ever be heard of in the history of this country, that the lords of this House should take upon themselves to destroy that constitution, which it has been found expedient to preserve from age to age, and which it has been thought expedient never to destroy until this experiment was proposed? Are you now to sweep away all the corporations in the kingdom, because they are close, and there may be abuses in them? The humble individual who now stands before you has some connexion with one of these corporations. I desire to ask any one who knows the practice of that place, with respect to returning members to parliament, whether there is any place in the world which has sent more proper members to the House of Commons than that? Well then, my lords, what is this sweeping disfranchisement that you propose? It is, first, to put an end to all the boroughs in schedule A; secondly,

it is to destroy all the corporations in the country; and thirdly, if it does not destroy the corporations, which, to a certain extent, it does, it introduces persons, who have no connection with the corporation, to vote along with the corporators, and thus to destroy the rights of those corporators. I am a freeman of Newcastle-upon-Tyne. I hold it to be one of the highest honours which I possess, and I consider it ought to be an encouragement to all the young rising men of that place, that any man in this country possessing moderate abilities, improved by industry, may raise himself to the highest situation in the country. For God's sake, my lords, never part with that principle. I received my education in the corporation school of that town on cheap terms. As the son of a freeman I had a right to it; and I had hoped that, when my ashes were laid in the grave, I might have given some memorandum, that boys, situated as I was, might rise to be chancellors of England, if, having the advantage of education, they were honest, faithful, and industrious in their dealings. But this bill says, that, although the king gave to the corporation of Newcastle-upon-Tyne certain privileges which have never before been touched, 2,700 three-and-sixpence a-week men shall be brought to co-operate with these 700 corporators. Mr. Fox laid it down, that, to disfranchise any place because even a majority of the electors were corrupt would not be just, unless an act was previously passed, declaring that it should be the law, that, if corruption were proved against a majority, the place should thereby be disfranchised. About the time of the



French revolution, there existed in this country three associations of a political character—the Friends of the People, the Corresponding Society, and the Constitutional Society. They all professed themselves friendly to reform, but none of them went so far as to put an end to all existing franchises. Two of these societies were proceeding pretty nearly in the same way as the Unions of the present day. Dangerous and inflammatory publications were in general circulation; delegates were sent over to France; and had steps not been taken to arrest the progress of their proceedings, your lordships would not now be sitting here. Let your lordships consent to deprive but one corporation, nay, one individual, of his rights, without proof of delinquency, unaccused and unheard—sacrifice your honour but in one case, and your glory was gone for ever. The proposed system of representation is utterly inconsistent with the existence of the House of Lords, and if this measure passes, there is an end to the monarchy.

The Lord Chancellor, after reviewing the different courses taken by the principal opponents of the bill, denied that the bill was founded upon population, and not property. How could it be said that population was the principle of the county representation, when a freehold interest, or the possession of some other species of real property, was the qualification. Even in the boroughs, property alone was the principle of the proposed representation. The 10*l.* franchise for country towns would limit the right to a class of persons in whose hands their lordships generally would be satisfied to see it placed. There might be a difference of

opinion as to the same qualification for London and some other large towns, but that was a subject for the committee to consider and determine. His opinions upon that part of the measure, and he now declared it, fearless of whom it might offend, were far from being satisfactorily concluded. He would not then enter into any explanation of what induced him to consent to the introduction of a uniform qualification in the bill, nor would he say any thing that should bind him to adopt any proposed change; but he would say, that, whoever was favourable to a modification of that part of the measure, should find him ready to give it his deepest consideration; and he now declared that it was emphatically a subject for deliberation in committee, and for such alterations as their lordships should think fitting. Another objection had been made to the working of the bill, which he confessed he did not find it easy to answer. The right of the crown to appoint its ministers was undisputed; and it had been asked how, under the bill, could that right be exercised? He did not see how the defect was to be remedied. But this he would say, that, if he had to choose between perpetuating corruptions, which had been exposed and deprecated by every writer, from Dean Swift downwards, and running the risk of suffering under the inconvenience apprehended, he would adopt the latter. But he was not in so hopeless a condition. If any plan could be devised which would remedy the evil and steer clear of the great abuses now complained of, such plan should have his most serious and friendly consideration; but, if no such plan could be discovered, then he was



content to take the lesser rather than the greater evil, and make the change proposed by the bill. It had been said, that the members returned under this bill will be delegates. In the first place, a member might happen to be a delegate, although there was but one delegator. Surely there could be no more mischief in a person being delegated by 4,000 persons, than by one or fourteen. A noble lord, an attorney, or a Jew jobber and loan contractor, who sent a member through a rotten borough, was as much a delegator as any constituency could by possibility be. A member returned by a real constituency, if a delegate, was still honest; whereas the nominee of an individual was returned under false and hypocritical pretences, for he was called the representative of the people, and the guardian of their interests, while, in fact, he was only a representative and guardian of the particular interests of the individual who had delegated him. It was monstrous to suppose that the same law would apply to parliament at the present time as formerly. Formerly, seats in parliament were a burthen, but now they were sought after, and bought and prized. Circumstances had changed; and the real innovators were those who proposed to maintain the laws unaltered, and not those who wished to adapt them upon old principles to altered circumstances. But their lordships had been told, that great men, under the present system, found their way into the House of Commons. Because a way was dirty, and people, from necessity, crossed it while dirty, was that a reason why it should not be swept? If he could not get into the House of Commons by a direct open way,

he took a bye way. He got in with as little dirt as he could. He bribed not—he corrupted not—but still the way was dirty, and, knowing it to be dirty from experience, that very fact made him the more desirous to cleanse it. But it was said the system worked well? Did the people think so? If it worked well, their lordships would not at this moment have been called upon to alter it, and there would not have been Political Unions throughout the country? It had been asked, what benefit might be expected to result from the change? He could enumerate many. A noble earl (Winchilsea) had pronounced a long and severe invective against the licentiousness of the press, and had said that the worst tyranny that was experienced in the present day was the tyranny exercised by the press. There certainly could be no doubt that the press exercised a great sway over the opinions of the people. But he was convinced that, if the people were represented by their legitimate organs, namely, parliamentary representatives, the press would lose the objectionable portion of its ascendancy. When the people obtained proper channels of representation, then, and not until then, their lordships might expect to see the press, instead of exercising, as it did, an unlimited sway, solely engaged in correcting the errors of the people, the errors of the government, and the errors of the representatives of the people. All that was unwholesome would be destroyed, while all that was desirable would be preserved. The learned lord concluded a speech of brilliant rhetoric, by emphatically calling on their lordships not to disappoint the anxious expectations of the people, but by



allowing the bill to go into a committee, to give themselves an opportunity of judging more leisurely of its probable effects.

Lord Lyndhurst resisted the bill, because it appeared to him not consistent with the prerogative of the crown, not consistent with the authority of their lordships' House—but, above all, because it was detrimental to the rights and liberties of the people. It was, he said, a satisfaction for his noble friends and himself to know, that, if they erred at all, they erred under high authority. The principle which they were supporting, had been advocated by the most profound philosophers and wisest statesmen. On this point great names had been quoted, and others, the highest authorities of former times, might be added; but he should pass from the dead to the living, and state that, if he then erred, he erred from the authority of the noble lord opposite (lord Grey). He should never forget a speech made on the first day of the last parliament by the noble lord at the head of his majesty's government. The noble lord then stated that he had, in early life, pursued this subject with the warmth, perhaps rashness, of youth, and that, in those times, he had gone further than at a later period he was prepared to go. Now the present measure far transcended the most extravagant plans of his early creation; and, in this career, one false step in advance was irretrievable. The learned lord on the woolsack had frequently maintained opinions similar to those which he (lord Lyndhurst) then supported. Much reliance had been placed by the supporters of the bill on the majorities by which it was carried in the House of Commons. No man

was more inclined than he was to treat the opinions of the other House of Parliament with every possible deference; but he could not forget their decisions upon former occasions. During the last session, the second reading of the bill was carried by a majority of only one, and it was quite clear from other divisions, that a majority of that House were men lately adverse to the bill. In looking at the votes of this session, he took them in connexion with former votes, and it was by judging of them together that he could best ascertain the real opinions of the Commons. Besides, the time of the dissolution was most unseasonable, and the mode of putting the question to the people was unwise. In effect, ministers told the people that they were defrauded of their rights, and they asked them—were they willing to have more power? Could there be any doubt of the answer? For the excitement which had prevailed, ministers were responsible. They had put the tranquillity of the country at peril, and upon their heads rested the responsibility. He recollected an article in the government press, in which excitement was urged! The language was unequivocal: it recommended the supporters of reform to strike in the face of their opponents. This was a part of their system, and it was not to be wondered at, under these circumstances, that there should be a large return of reforming members. The most unjustifiable use had also been made of the king's name. It was held out at the elections, that the reformers were contending for an object in which his majesty had a personal interest. He had heard it asked how the bill would operate? Some an-



swered in a whisper, that it would increase the aristocratic influence; others said it would be impossible to guess, until the experiment was tried. The theory of the constitution was formed upon practice, and those who thought that the constitution was the result of theory inverted the order of things. He did not mean to defend the constitution of the present House of Commons in all its parts; but he would say, that he felt a reluctance to change a system which had existed without any material change for the last 160 years. The House of Commons was now the same as it had been for two centuries, and it became them to inquire what this stigmatised House of Commons had done. What had not the House of Commons accomplished in gradually working out advantages for the people? The right of granting monopolies, the oppressive and inconvenient rights of purveyance, that of levying taxes without the consent of parliament, the dispensing power, all had been overthrown by the energy and public virtue of that House of Commons which they were now so desirous to abolish. So far from any change to the disadvantage of the House of Commons having taken place in modern days, at no period had that assembly been composed of more able, intelligent, virtuous, patriotic, and independent men, than during the last fifteen years. Whither did this bill lead? At present they could give a good reason to those who called upon them to new-model the constitution. They could now advance the argument of prescription. But when Horsham, with 4,000 inhabitants, was to have two members, and Huddersfield, with 40,000, was to have only one, how were they to

answer the reasonable complaints of Huddersfield? The bill was a measure of extensive disfranchisement, transferring by wholesale the representation from one part of the country to another, and for this no reason was assigned. The elective franchise was said to be a trust coupled with an interest. And who could deny, that the interest was a most valuable one? The office of Earl Marshal was a trust coupled with an interest: and would it not be hard if the noble duke were deprived of this hereditary trust and interest, and, when called upon to divest himself of it, would it not be reasonable on his part to ask why? Oh, but perhaps it would be said, the privilege was abused. Why this was wholly inconsistent with the provisions of this very bill. The right was preserved by the bill to all existing voters. But the defects and anomalies of the bill all vanished into nothing in comparison with that consideration which had pressed upon his mind ever since he became acquainted with the ministerial plan. What would be the new composition of the House of Commons? He knew what the House of Commons was. He had served a pretty long apprenticeship there. Even at present it was an unmanageable body. Then what would it become after the passing of this bill? An unmanageable democratic assembly, too much for the Lords and too much for the crown. From the moment this bill came into operation, the government of England would be essentially a republic. He had been sworn to maintain the monarchical constitution of Great Britain. To that constitution he was seriously attached, from habit and reflection. He thought



a republic an uncertain, precarious, fluctuating, and violent system of government, and he would not willingly substitute it for the ancient constitutional monarchy of England. Would the Church of Ireland stand? The Protestants of Ireland were a small community; but, hitherto, they had possession of the wealth and the political power of the country, and this enabled them to make a stand against the encroachments of the Roman Catholics. It was impossible that, after the passing of this bill, the Church of Ireland could exist. A noble lord, on presenting a petition the other night, had boasted that the petitioners desired only the bill, and had abandoned all their other objects. Could he be so innocent and simple as to be taken in by this? Did he know so little of human nature as to imagine that every other object was abandoned? Were men grown all at once so moderate, and reasonable, and mild, that, when you had given them power, they would not use it for the attainment of their own objects? The noble lords who opened the flood-gates of insurrection would be swept away by the torrent, not even excepting his noble and learned friend on the woolsack, who though he might be enabled, by his peculiar dexterity, elasticity, and vigour, to float for a time upon the tide, and play his gambols on its surface, would at last sink with the rest. When men cried out for reform, it was not a barren reform that they desired. They did not wish for reform for its own sake, but for the sake of its consequences—the subversion of church property, particularly tithes. It was one of the most remarkable signs of the times, that there were to be found lawyers of great eminence

and learning, who contended that, by law, the tithe might be taken away from the church, and applied to, what they called, its original purposes. What was the next point with the reformers? Funded property. They demanded a reduction of taxes to an amount wholly incompatible with the preservation of national faith. Was this visionary? Who was the favourite candidate for Manchester? Mr. Cobbett. He had already explained his views to his future constituents, and they fully concurred in them. But who supported him? He was supported, and this was a most awful sign of the times, by a peer of great talent and excellent private character, who wrote a letter to Mr. Cobbett's committee, offering a subscription to secure his return, and approving of all his views, and particularly of every word of the Norfolk petition. Then what were the points upon which this Norfolk petition principally insisted? The first was the application of church property in discharge of the public debt; and the second, an equitable adjustment with the public creditor, or, in other words, a scandalous and flagrant violation of public faith. Then their lordships were threatened in all imaginable ways, in newspapers and pamphlets, and by hypocritical advisers, who, in the garb of anonymous pamphlets, vented their menaces, their insults, and their malice; and within the walls of that House, though the noble earl and his learned friend upon the woolsack had not employed direct terms of menace, their language implied it as strongly as any of their incendiary supporters of the public press. If he thought their lordships capable of bending to the ignoble motive of fear, he



would be ashamed of the dignity he had acquired, would bury himself in obscurity, and avoid to show his face within these desecrated walls. Their lordships were placed there as a barrier against the Crown, and bound to protect it against its own imprudence and folly, if such qualities should unfortunately ever be exhibited. They were placed there as a barrier against the ministers of the Crown in case they should betray the sovereign, or seek to subvert the liberties of the people, or attempt any invasion of the rights of any other order of the state. They were placed there as a barrier against rash, dangerous, and hasty legislation, whenever attempted by the other House of Parliament. This was the crisis of their fate. If they now timidly abdicated their trust, they would never be able to resume it. The rights and liberties of the people, together with their own properties and titles, would be trampled in the dust. Their properties and titles they had received as a trust, and, if they suffered them to be disgraced in their hands, they would be degraded for ever. Perilous as their position was, he felt that they stood upon a pinnacle before the face of the world, and, if they did their duty as became them, they would receive the approbation of their own conscience, and the applause of an enlightened and honourable community.

Lord Tenterden could not view without great dissatisfaction the rights of all corporate bodies, whether acquired by charter or prescription, treated with the contempt which was shown towards them by this bill. If it had been intended only to transfer the right of representation from the unsound to the more healthy parts of the

community, he should not have opposed the scheme. He respected the middle ranks of society; he was bound to do so, for he sprang from among them. But he could not consent to confer upon them power going infinitely beyond any thing they had ever desired; nor could he agree to put the whole institutions of the country upon an entirely new footing, in deference to any views of expediency.

The Archbishop of Canterbury opposed the bill, he said, from an honest persuasion of its mischievous tendency, and of the danger to which it would expose the fabric of the constitution. The Duke of Sussex supported the bill: and the Duke of Gloucester, though he had long desired to see a safe and temperate plan of reform brought forward, considered the present scheme to be a proposition for a new constitution, and therefore opposed it.

Lord Grey, in his reply, complained that the opposition to the measure seemed to be carried on, less with a view to defeat the bill, than to drive its advocates from office. He repeated, that to the present measure, or to one of equal extent, he was pledged: and if a more moderate scheme would satisfy the people, although no man could be more happy to see that result, he would not be the person to introduce such a measure. As to what course he should follow under those circumstances, it was for him to consider. But this much he would say, that he should be culpable if he were to resign his office, and abandon his king, so long as he could be of use to him; for he was bound to him by gratitude as great as ever subject owed a sovereign.

The House then proceeded to



divide ;—the numbers were, Con- —Proxies 49 ; 199. Leaving a  
 tents, Present 128—Proxies 30 ; majority of 41 against the bill.\*  
 158 : Not-Contents, Present 150 The division in the House of

## \* LIST OF THE CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Sussex.	<i>Viscounts.</i>	Milbourne (Viscount Mel- bourne)
<i>Dukes.</i>	Bolingbroke	Mendip (Visc. Clifden)
Brandon and Hamilton	Falkland	Montfort
Devonshire	Goderich	Mount Eagle (Marquess of Sligo)
Grafton	Granville	Mostyn
Norfolk	Hood	Napier
Richmond	Leinster (D. of Leinster).	Oakley
St. Alban's.	<i>Barons.</i>	Ormonde (Marquess of Ormonde)
<i>Marquesses.</i>	Abercromby	Panmure
Anglesey	Alvanley	Petre
Cleveland	Audley	Poltimore
Hastings	Barham	Ponsonby of Imokilly
Lansdowne	Belhaven	Ponsonby (Earl of Bess- borough)
Queensberry	Boyle (Earl of Cork)	Plunkett
Westmeath	Braybrooke	Rossie (Lord Kinnauld)
Westminster	Brougham	Rosebery (Earl of Rose- bery)
Winchester.	Byron	Saye and Sele
<i>Earls.</i>	Chaworth (E. of Meath)	Seaford
Albemarle	Clements (E. of Leitrim)	Sefton (Earl of Sefton)
Amherst	Clifton (E. of Darnley)	Segrave
Camperdown	Clinton	Sherborne
Carlisle	Cloncurry	Somerhill (Marquess of Clanricarde)
Cawdor	Dacre	Stafford
Charlemont	Dawnay (Visc. Downe)	Stourton
Chichester	De Clifford	Suffield
Clarendon	De Saumarez	Sundridge (D. of Argyll)
Cornwallis	Dinorben	Templemore
Cowper	Dormer	Teynham
Craven	Dover	Vernon
Denbigh	Ducie	Wellesley (M. Wellesley)
Essex	Dunalley	Wenlock
Gosford	Dundas	Willoughby of Eresby
Grey	Dunmore (E. of Dunmore)	Yarborough.
Hillsborough (Marquis of Downshire)	Fife (E. of Fife)	<i>Bishop.</i>
Ilchester	Fingall (Earl of Fingall)	Chichester.
Lichfield	Fisherwick (Marquess of Donegall)	<i>Teller.</i>
Manvers	Foley	Lord Auckland.
Minto	Gardner	<i>PROXIES.</i>
Morley	Gower	<i>Dukes.</i>
Mulgrave	Holland	Bedford
Munster	Howden	Portland
Onslow	Howard de Walden	Somerset.
Oxford	Howard of Effingham	
Pomfret	Kenlis (M. of Headfort)	
Radnor	Kilmarnock (E. of Erroll)	
Romney	Kiug	
Suffolk	Lilford	
Thanet.	Ludlow (Earl of Ludlow)	
	Lynedoch	
	Littleton	



Lords took place at a quarter past October. When the House of Commons met on Monday the 10th,

<i>Marquesses.</i>	Nelson	Erskine
Ailsa	Shrewsbury	Glenlyon
Bredalbane	Spencer.	Granard (E. of Granard)
Northampton		Hawke
Stafford.	<i>Viscounts.</i>	Lovell and Holland (Earl of Egmont)
	Lake	Ranfurly (Earl of Ranfurly)
<i>Earls.</i>	St. Vincent.	Selsey
Buckinghamshire		Sondes.
Burlington	<i>Barons.</i>	
Derby	Carlton (E. of Shannon)	<i>Bishop.</i>
Ferrers	Clifford of Chudleigh	Norwich.
Fortescue	Durham	
Huntingdon		

## LIST OF THE NOT-CONTENTS.

His R. H. the Duke of Cumberland.	Delaware	Westmorland
His R. H. the Duke of Gloucester.	Digby	Wicklow
	Doncaster (Duke of Buccleugh)	Wilton
<i>Dukes.</i>	Dudley	Winchilsea
Beaufort	Eldon	<i>Viscounts.</i>
Buckingham	Enniskillen	Arbuthnott
Dorset	Falmouth	Beresford
Leeds	Glengall	Combermere
Manchester	Guildford	Doneraile
Newcastle	Harewood	Gordon (E. of Aberdeen)
Rutland	Hardwicke	Hereford
Wellington.	Harrowby	Lorton
	Home	Maynard
<i>Marquesses.</i>	Howe	Melville
Ailesbury	Jersey	Sidmouth
Bath	Limerick	Sydney,
Bristol	Liverpool	<i>Barons.</i>
Bute	Longford	Arden
Camden	Lonsdale	Arundel
Cholmondeley	Mansfield	Bayning
Exeter	Mayo	Bexley
Hertford	Morton	Bolton
Salisbury	Mountcashel	Boston
Thomond.	Norwich (D. of Gordon)	Carbery
	Orford	Carteret
<i>Earls.</i>	Plymouth	Clanbrassill (E. of Roden)
Abingdon	Poulett	Clanwilliam (Earl of Clanwilliam)
Aylesford	Powis	Colville
Bathurst	Rosslyn	Cowley
Beauchamp	Selkirk	Delamere
Beverley	Shaftesbury	De Roos
Bradford	St. Germain's	Douglas
Brownlow	Talbot	Dufferin
Caernarvon	Tankerville	Dynevor
Caledon	Vane (M. of Londonderry)	Ellenborough
Coventry	Verulam	Farnborough
Dartmouth	Waldegrave	
	Warwick	



lord Ebrington brought forward a motion, the object of which was to prevent ministers from resigning, by pledging the House of Commons to support them, which amounted to a pledge to resist any successor. He founded the claims of ministers to public confidence, not merely on what they had done for the question of reform, but likewise on other measures which had distinguished their course, the relief, in particular, granted to the poor by the repeal of the duty on soap and candles; the improvement which they had introduced into

criminal jurisprudence by alterations in the game laws; and the cleansing of the Augean stable of chancery by the gigantic efforts of lord Brougham. They had found the country in a condition which made thinking men despair of its ever being restored to a healthy state; yet they had speedily brought back peace to the country, and had done so, without having recourse to coercive measures, or to any new penal enactment, by pledging themselves to bring forward, in their official capacity, a measure of parliamentary

Feversham  
Forbes  
Forester  
Gage (Viscount Gage)  
Gambier  
Grantham  
Hay (Earl of Kinnoul)  
Kerr (M. Lothian)  
Lyndhurst  
Manners  
Maryborough  
Meldrum (E. of Aboyne)  
Melros (E. of Harrington)  
Monson  
Montagu  
Northwick  
Penshurst (V. Strangford)  
Prudhoe  
Ravensworth  
Redesdale  
Ribblesdale  
Rodney  
Rolle  
Saltoun  
Sheffield (E. of Sheffield)  
Skelmersdale  
Southampton  
Stuart de Rothsay  
Tenterden  
Wallace  
Walsingham  
Wharncliffe  
Willoughby de Broke  
Wynford.

*Bishops.*

Canterbury (Archbishop)  
Bath and Wells  
Bristol

Exeter  
Gloucester  
Llandaff  
Lincoln  
Lichfield  
Oxford  
Rochester  
Salisbury  
Winchester.

*Teller.*

Lord Kenyon.

## PROXIES.

*Dukes.*

Marlborough  
Northumberland.

*Marquis.*

Tweeddale.

*Earls.*

Cardigan  
Carrick  
Charleville  
Chesterfield  
Elgin  
Graham (D. of Montrose)  
Leven and Melville  
Lucan  
Macclesfield  
Malmesbury  
Mount Edgecumbe  
Scarborough  
Stamford.

*Viscounts.*

Clancarty (Earl of Clan  
carty)

Exmouth  
Gort  
Strathallan.

*Barons.*

Bagot  
Calthorpe  
Carrington  
Churchill  
Colchester  
De Dunstanville  
Farnham  
Grantley  
Gray  
Harris  
Hopetoun (E. of Hope-  
toun)  
Loftus (Marquess of Ely)  
Lauderdale (E. of Lau-  
derdale)  
Rivers  
Ross (Earl of Glasgow)  
Saltersford (E. of Cour-  
town)  
Scarsdale  
St. Helen's  
Stowell  
Wigan (Earl of Balcarras.)

*Bishops.*

Tuam (Archbishop)  
Bangor  
Carlisle  
Cloyne  
Cork  
Durham  
Leighlin and Ferns  
Peterborough  
St. Asaph.



reform. That pledge they had redeemed: and whether they should be enabled to carry their work through now depended on that House. The passing of the reform bill into a law, could not be long delayed; ministers had only to persist firmly, for they had the country unalterably on their side: and the present motion was intended to give them the confidence which only that House could impart, and support them against the numerous and designing enemies who beset them in every hole and corner, and hardly any where else. He therefore moved the following resolution, "That, while this House laments the present state of a bill for introducing a reform into the Commons House of Parliament, in favour of which the opinion of the country stands unequivocally pronounced, and which has been matured by discussions the most anxious and the most laborious, it feels itself most imperatively called upon to re-assert its firm adherence to the principles and leading provisions of that great measure, and to express its unabated confidence in the integrity, perseverance, and ability of those ministers, who, in introducing and conducting it, so well consulted the best interests of the country."

Mr. Macauley, Mr. Sheil, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. F. Duncombe, and some other members spoke in favour of the motion, all arguing that the continuance of ministers in office was, as matters stood, the only thing that would secure public tranquillity, and that perseverance for a short time was sure to make reform triumphant, while the resignation of ministers, by disappointing all the hopes of the people, would produce a state of

things where demagogues would be above the law. The constitution would be practically suspended, the authorities derided, the calls of the tax-gatherers disregarded, property insecure, public credit shaken, and the whole frame of society in hourly danger of being resolved into its first elements. Both the temporal and spiritual members of the upper House, were spoken of in language which did any thing but tend to peaceful submission under the lawful exercise of a constitutional right; and resistance, by all means short of open violence, while it was predicted without reprobation, was indirectly encouraged. Mr. Sheil advised the ministers not to allow "the mitre to rest on one Iscariot brow." Mr. Hume described the vote of the House of Lords to be the unreasonable and wilful blindness of a miserable minority withholding from the majority their "just rights:" as if the peers had already been lumped into one body with the *Tiers Etat*; and others insisted that government should not hesitate, if it seemed necessary, to create as many new peers as might be required to secure a triumphant majority. "If there be a majority of 41 in the Lords, why not create 82?" The people "have sent a sweeping majority of reformers into this House: why should not ministers send an equally decisive majority into the other?"

The motion was opposed by Mr. Goulburn, Sir C. Wetherell, Mr. Croker, and Sir R. Peel, and other members, as being unnecessary and unfounded. If agreed to, it would be a mere repetition of former votes. It was so worded, as of set purpose, though ostensibly meant to quiet the country,



that it was impossible for any man, who had conscientiously opposed the bill, to support it. It only forced the House back into angry debates, while all that could be necessary simply was, for ministers to have declared that they were determined to persevere with the bill. The language already used shewed plainly how little discussions like the present, could tend to produce a peaceful submission to the law; for all advice to obey the law was accompanied with assurances that the law would be powerless. If ever there were prophecies, the making of which led to realizing their own fulfilment, it was those prophetic declarations, which were likely to produce the very result they predicted. If the people were so determined in favour of the bill, for God's sake let ministers be satisfied with that, instead of urging them on. Whilst they proclaimed their adherence to this bill, they ought to be cautious of inflaming the passions of the people; that was the duty of them all. They ought not to represent to the people that it was a slight matter to refuse the payment of taxes, nor to exaggerate the numbers of popular meetings. They ought to be sure, when they talked of 150,000 at this place, and 40,000 at that, that they were correct as to the fact, for the mention of numbers added confidence. They ought to tell those who were eager to defy the law, and to refuse the payment of taxes, that they were paralyzing industry, and acting as the bitterest enemies of the lower classes. They ought to tell them that the privileges of the House of Lords were not private privileges, granted for the gratification of mere personal feelings, but

that they existed for the benefit of the people.

Lord Althorp declared that the present measure had been brought forward without any suggestion on the part of ministers. For himself, unless he felt a reasonable hope, that a measure equally efficient would be brought forward and carried, he would not remain in office a single hour. He did not mean to say that, after discussion, modifications might not be made, which, without diminishing the efficiency of the measure, might make it more perfect. But he would not be a party to any measure, which he did not, in his conscience, believe would give a full, fair, and free representation of the people in parliament, and effect all the objects which would have been effected by this bill. Having said this, he need not say that government did not contemplate making any other proposition to the House. The opponents of reform had certainly gained a great triumph, and might doubtless rejoice in their success; not that he thought that any great triumph would eventually be gained, for he was confident that the measure was only postponed. If the people of England remained firm and determined, but peaceable, he hoped and believed that there was no doubt of their ultimate and speedy success. There was only one chance of failure—if their disappointment led them into acts of violence, or to unconstitutional measures of resistance.

The motion was carried by 329 votes against 198, being a majority of 131.

While the discussion was going on in the Lords, the House of Commons had gone through such



matters of business as were necessary to be disposed of preparatory to a prorogation. The reform meetings and the reform press had already laid down to ministers the course which they must adopt, if they wished to retain the confidence of the country—the prorogation must be a brief one, only sufficient to allow the necessary number of peers to be created. Lord Howe, the Queen's Chamberlain, was immediately dismissed from his office, because he had voted against the bill, although he had received the assurance of his majesty himself, that his office was to have no connection with any vote which he might give. A question being put to ministers regarding this occurrence, in the House of Commons, on the 13th of October, lord John Russell answered, that, so far as he was informed, it was not till after his vote against the Reform Bill, that earl Howe had tendered his resignation, and his resignation had been accepted. This assertion called forth a letter from lord Howe, which was read in the House of Commons, giving it a direct contradiction, as being inconsistent with fact. His lordship stated, "In the month of May last, and for the second time, I submitted to his majesty my intention of opposing the Reform Bill, and my perfect readiness to resign my situation of Chamberlain to the Queen, at any moment that he might be pleased to fix on. I received in reply a most gracious command to retain my office, and a distinct recognition of my privilege of being perfectly independent of any government, from the circumstance of my being in her Majesty's household. My having offered to resign again was out of the question, as I was

allowed, by the King's own communication, to act and vote exactly as I pleased. Nothing, therefore, but the positive request of lord Grey and his colleagues to the King for my removal, in consequence of my vote the other night, has been the cause of my being no longer in her Majesty's household." Ministers were then asked, whether lord Howe had been dismissed on account of his vote, notwithstanding the positive assurance of his majesty, that he might vote on the Reform Bill as he chose? Lord Althorp declined to answer the question. No successor to lord Howe was appointed.

In London, any symptoms of the anarchy, which the demagogues had uniformly threatened would be the necessary consequence of the loss of the bill, were exhibited only by the lowest of the rabble. The more respectable reformers held their meetings, made violent speeches, abused the bishops, and voted addresses to the king for the levying of a new regiment of reform peers. The lower reformers, who clamoured still more loudly for all these things, broke the windows, and picked the pocket of the duke of Newcastle, and assaulted the duke of Cumberland, the duke of Wellington, and the marquis of Londonderry—the latter nobleman being struck senseless from his horse. On the 12th, what was called a procession of the parishes of London marched, with great variety of flags, to St. James's palace, to present addresses which had been voted to his majesty. The Home Secretary advised them to deliver the addresses for presentation, to the county members, Mr. Byng and Mr. Hume. Those gentlemen forth-



with performed that duty, and the mob, in the mean time, amused themselves with breaking the windows of the marquis of Bristol, proceeding afterwards to pay a similar compliment to those of lord Dudley and the duke of Wellington.

Throughout the country, no approach to political disturbance was any where exhibited, except at Derby and Nottingham. At the former place, the reforming mob attacked the houses, and demolished the windows of many of the inhabitants who were known or suspected to be adverse to the bill. Some of these rioters having been committed to the borough gaol, the mob assaulted and carried the gaol, liberating all the prisoners. They next attacked the county gaol; but being there resisted with fire-arms, they were repulsed, and the arrival of military put a stop to their outrages, though not before several lives had been lost, great injury inflicted upon property, and all business suspended for nearly two days. At Nottingham, the first object of the fury of the rabble was the ancient castle of Nottingham, once a royal residence, now the property of the duke of Newcastle. They forced an entrance, and set the building on fire; all attempts to render assistance were frustrated; in a short time, the whole of the immense edifice was a pile of smoking ruins. A regiment of Hussars which hastened into the town, arrived too late to prevent the mischief, but prevented the rioters from acting seriously on any other point. Detachments of them, however, marched against the seats of individuals in the neighbourhood, whose politics were obnoxious. They found the residence of lord

Middleton so well prepared for defence, that they abandoned their intended attack. That of Mr. Musters was less fortunate. It was sacked and pillaged. His wife, he himself being absent, had to seek concealment under the bushes of the shrubbery in a cold and rainy October evening. The terror and exposure cost the unfortunate lady her life.

These were the consequences of the House of Peers having dared to exercise its undoubted privilege of forming its own opinions on a matter of legislation, and to maintain its rights as an independent part of the constitution. It was plain enough, too, that the wishes or opinions of the mobs, who could be guilty of outrages like these, were not things to be taken for a moment into account, in deciding on a great political question. In both Houses of Parliament, ministers loudly expressed their disapprobation of such proceedings; but their opponents charged them with having indirectly encouraged them by the language which they themselves held, and the connection in which they had placed themselves with bodies of men acting illegally. While the bill was before the Lords, the Political Union of Birmingham held a meeting in the open air, to which were collected large multitudes from the neighbouring towns. The number of persons present was said, by the reformers, to have amounted to 150,000 men—a gross exaggeration which nobody believed. The meeting voted an address to the king, setting forth their alarm at “the awful consequences” which might arise from the failure of the bill—their pain at imagining it possible “that the House of Lords should be so far in-



fatuated as to reject it"—and their earnest desire that his majesty should create as many peers as might be necessary to insure its success. The speaker who moved one of the resolutions thus expressed himself: "They were all acquainted with a peaceful, orderly, and most respectable body of men called Quakers, to whose example he wished specially to call the attention of the meeting. This respectable sect of Christians refused to support a parson, but, in their opposition, they did not knock out the brains of the tithe-collector—they simply suffered a distress to be levied upon their goods. Now, if the Quakers refused to pay the tithes, the people generally might refuse to pay the taxes; and, if the bailiff came, he should like to know where they would find the auctioneer who would dare to sell, or the people who would dare to buy. The voice of the auctioneer, he conceived, would be passive, not active; and rather than knocking down, he would be himself knocked down. While upon this point, he could not but think of another glorious patriot, whose name and character, during a long night of despotism, shone bright as the day-star of British liberty, whose example ought to be as an encouraging beacon for their future guidance. When Hampden refused the payment of ship-money, his gallant conduct electrified all England, and pointed out the way by which the people, when unanimous and combined, might rid themselves of an odious and oppressive oligarchy. He declared before God, that, if all constitutional modes of obtaining the success of the reform measure failed, he should and would, be the first man to refuse the payment of taxes, except by a levy

upon his goods [*tremendous cheering, which lasted some minutes*]. I now call upon all who hear me, and who are prepared to join me in this step, to hold up your hands [*an immense forest of hands was immediately elevated, accompanied by vehement cheering*]. I now call upon you who are not prepared to adopt this course, to hold up your hands and signify your dissent [*not a single hand appearing, loud shouts and cheers were repeated*]. Mark my words—failing all other more constitutional means." Another speaker said, "It is said that the Reverend Fathers in God, the Bishops, will oppose this bill: if they do, their fate, which even now is exceedingly doubtful, will be irrevocably sealed. The haughty pinnacles of the establishment will be buried in the dust, with a nation's execration for their epitaph; the splendid mitre will fall from the heads of the bishops; their crosses will fall as if from a palsied hand; their robes of lawn may be turned into the garb of mourning; and my lord the Bishop of London may shut up his episcopal palace, and take out a license for a beer-shop."

One of the resolutions agreed to by the meeting which so eagerly adopted these illegal doctrines, and applauded this violent language, was a vote of thanks to lord Althorp and lord John Russell. The letters of these noblemen, containing their answers to that vote, were written to the chairman of the meeting immediately after the division in the House of Lords. Lord Althorp's was in the following terms: "I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter containing a vote of thanks to me from the great meeting at which you presided. The unanimous approbation of 150,000



of my fellow-countrymen is no trifling honour; I feel sincerely thankful for it, and I beg to assure you that it gives me the highest gratification. The large majority by which the bill has been lost in the House of Lords is, I fear, a very serious calamity. It can only, however, postpone the success of our cause; but I beseech you to use all your influence, not merely to prevent any acts of open violence, but any such resistance to the law as is threatened by the refusal to pay taxes. Such a course as this is the one least likely to promote our success." It may be reasonably doubted, whether his lordship would not better have consulted the duty and dignity of his office by declining all thanks from, or any communication with, a body of men who had openly expressed their willingness to have recourse to illegal proceedings. His answer, however, was caution itself compared with that of lord John Russell, who wrote thus: "I beg to acknowledge, with heartfelt gratitude, the undeserved honour done me by 150,000 of my countrymen. Our prospects are now obscured for a moment, and I trust only for a moment. It is impossible that the whisper of faction should prevail against the voice of a nation." This language, used in regard to one of the branches of the legislature, and that branch against which every exertion was making to stir up popular fury, occasioned a warm conversation in the House of Commons on the 12th of October. A Mr. Ruthven, a reforming member, took the opportunity of presenting a petition, to abuse the bishops, and he added, referring to the procession to St. James's Palace already mentioned, that he was convinced the bill must be passed,

"by the peaceable manner in which the people had conducted themselves that day in a procession, which, though its numbers rendered it formidable, was deprived of all terror by its quiet, tranquil, and regular demeanour." Sir Henry Hardinge immediately expressed his astonishment at a declaration, that the people had that day conducted themselves in a quiet, and regular, and peaceable manner, when it was notorious that the marquis of Londonderry, in coming down to the House, had, in the most cowardly and dastardly manner, been struck off his horse by a shower of stones, and been so wounded as to be obliged to be taken home in a hackney-coach. Though he admitted, that many honest and respectable men might join these processions, nothing could be more illegal, or, indeed, more unconstitutional, than this mode of bearding the king in his very palace. He contended, that this system of letting the people assemble, and march about in processions of large masses, to present their petitions to the king, must, if continued, lead to great confusion. Where was this peaceable conduct of the people to be found? Was it to be found in the attacks which the populace were making, day after day, on the windows of the duke of Wellington? What, however, must the country expect, when it found ministers in the cabinet corresponding with the Political Unions of Birmingham and Manchester? As he saw in his place the noble lord who had rendered himself famous—he would not use the other word, for he did not think the noble lord deserved it—by the introduction of this bill of reform, and, as he had seen in the public journals the correspond-



ence of that noble lord with the Political Union of Birmingham, he would avail himself of the present opportunity to offer a few comments upon it. The noble lord said, that "he acknowledged with heartfelt gratitude the undeserved honour which had been done him by 150,000 of his countrymen." The noble lord, alluding to the rejection of the bill by the House of Lords, then added, that "though their projects were obscured for a moment, he trusted that it was only for a moment, for it was impossible that the whisper of a faction should prevail against the voice of the nation." The use of language like this completely identified the cabinet with all the political unions, and the noble lord, in calling the decision of the House of Peers the whisper of a faction, encouraged the passions and feelings by which such masses of men were unfortunately actuated. When he was told, that the processions of that day had passed off peaceably and orderly, and when he saw a letter from the noble lord expressive of the heartfelt gratitude which he felt for the vote of thanks which he had received from a meeting of 150,000 persons, which the noble lord on the woolsack had described as guilty of sedition and a capital felony, he could not understand on what principles this government was conducted. He hoped that hon. members would not be deterred—he, at least, would not himself be deterred—from the honest discharge of his duty, by the dastardly attacks which any portion of the misguided populace might make upon him. He did not mean to say, that the noble lord opposite had either originated or sanctioned such attacks, but this he must say, that the

noble lord adopted a very extraordinary way to allay the temper of the people, when he entered into a correspondence with them, and declared his heartfelt gratitude for the thanks which they had bestowed upon them.

Lord John Russell admitted at once that the dangerous attack which had been that day made, for the second time, on the marquis of Londonderry, was cowardly and disgraceful; that to attack the House of any of the peers was base and disgraceful; that such an attack was doubly base and disgraceful when made on the duke of Wellington to whom the country was so deeply indebted; that the continuance of such outrages could be looked on in no other light than a declaration of hostility against all good government, and would alienate the minds of all sober and respectable men from the cause of reform. But it was scarcely less unfair to couple his letter, in any degree, with these proceedings. He would not enter into the question of the propriety of corresponding with the Birmingham Political Union, for, in this case, no such question could arise. Mr. Attwood, the banker of Birmingham, had written to him stating that there had been a great meeting at Birmingham, at which he believed 150,000 persons were present. He would not say that the meeting was so large as Mr. Attwood had represented it, but still it was a large meeting, and that meeting had thanked his majesty's government for the manner in which they had conducted the bill through the Commons' House of Parliament. In such a resolution on the part of the meeting, he saw nothing unconstitutional, nothing inconsistent with the rights which as Eng-



lishmen they possessed, and more especially nothing inconsistent with that right which they had enjoyed from their ancestors—he meant the right of pronouncing an opinion upon the conduct either of government or of opposition. He had therefore thought that it was a duty which he owed to the people of Birmingham and himself, to express his gratitude to them for the vote of thanks which they had given to his majesty's ministers generally, and to himself individually; and he had yet to learn that there had been any thing in the conduct of that meeting which ought to lead him to refuse accepting a vote of thanks from it. He saw no reason why he should say to the thousands who had been awaiting with interest the result of this bill, "You are unfit to be consulted by the king's government, and I therefore repudiate your praise." On the contrary, he thought that he might notice the loyalty and good sense of the people of Birmingham; and he imagined that, when he stated that the success of the reform bill was only deferred for a time, but was still certain, he was expressing a sentiment, which, so far from leading to tumult, would induce the people to wait with patience for the re-introduction of that measure to which they attached so much importance. He had undoubtedly said, and he now repeated the assertion, "it was impossible that the whisper of faction should prevail against the voice of a nation." It was a sentiment which he had expressed on first receiving Mr. Attwood's letter, and he now saw no reason either to retract or to withdraw it. He thought that the number of those who supported the reform bill, compared with the

small number of those who opposed it, justified him in stating that the reformers were the nation, and that the greater part of the opponents to the bill did belong to, and might justly be denominated, a faction. Such being his sentiments he could not think of retracting any expression in that letter. Sir Henry Hardinge immediately said this sort of interpretation would never do. The only meaning of the letter was, that the determination of a great majority of the House of Lords was the whisper of a faction—and the question was, to which question lord John Russell had not said a word, how could lord John Russell justify himself for having used such language? That expression he had used; from the use of it it was impossible for him to escape; and in using it he had identified himself as a minister of the crown, with illegal combinations declaring their readiness to commit illegal acts. Sir R. Vyvyan enforced the same views. He asked, if lord John Russell, in using the words "the whisper of faction," did not allude to the majority in the House of Lords, what did he mean by them? Did he mean to notice the fact, that sums of money had been promised and paid to particular noble individuals for their votes? Did he mean to acknowledge that certain balls were to be placed higher or lower on certain coronets, and that balls were also to be taken off altogether and strawberry-leaves substituted in some coronets as a reward for the partisanship of their wearers? Did he allude to the bench of bishops who were now so reviled for their opposition to government, although it had always hitherto been the fashion to vituperate them for habitually paying court to the



powers that be? Surely, by opposing ministers, those right rev. prelates could, at all events, gain nothing, whatever they might have lost. But was the noble lord quite sure that the voice of public opinion was really in favour of this bill? The contest which was now proceeding with such vigour in the county of Dorset, he thought might at least induce them to be a little diffident as to the correctness of their assumption in the affirmative. Had they any right to talk of the voice of public opinion as being exclusively in their favour, when the anti-bill candidate at this moment had brought as many votes to the poll as his opponent?\*

If more, the case was so much the stronger; but if as many, it was sufficient for his argument, which was, that the country was at least divided upon the question, and that was a sufficient refutation of the assertion of gentlemen opposite, that a contested election would be attended with the same results in every other county in England, if opportunity were afforded for so extensive a demonstration of opinion. Did the House remember the triumphant chuckling of the press at the approach of the election for Dorset? No anti-reformer, forsooth, could think of coming forward, and yet lord Ashley, who had not declared himself till two days before they went to the hustings, occupied his present station upon the poll, after more freehold-

---

\* An unexpected vacancy had taken place in the representation of Dorsetshire, in consequence of the death of Mr. Calcraft who, by declaring himself a convert to the bill, had ousted Mr. Bankes at the general election. Mr. Ponsonby now started as the reformer, and lord Ashley became his antagonist as an opponent of the bill. Lord Ashley carried the election.

ers had voted than perhaps had ever before been polled upon any similar occasion. Once more he demanded what party the noble lord meant by the expressions in his letter. But he wished also to direct the attention of the House to the processions of that day through the streets of London, consisting of crowds with white ribands tied on their arms, on which were inscribed the words "national union." Had not these unions been in existence prior to 1793, and were they not suppressed by the interposition of the legislature, and were they not also put down in like manner on their revival in 1819?

Lord John Russell again declared that he had not the majority in the House of Lords in view when he spoke of "the whisper of a faction;" that the lords undoubtedly had as good a right to reject the bill as the Commons had to agree to it, and were perfectly entitled to vote in what way they thought proper; but that there might still be factions in Parliament who, in opposing the bill, were only seeking to promote their own interests. He indignantly repelled any idea that ministers did not feel and perform the duty of assuaging and suppressing all attempts at disorder: but, added his lordship, at the "same time I cannot imagine a more ungrateful task than what is now imposed upon government which first gave its sanction to so important a measure, and is afterwards constrained to coerce the people into acquiescence in a decision which retards, for a time, their just and reasonable expectations." Now the objects of ministerial coercion were the destroyers of life and the pillagers of property. Were these the men whose "just



and reasonable expectations" were to be gratified by the reform bill? did ministers really feel the duty of preventing or punishing atrocious crimes an unpleasant duty, because the criminals were political partisans on their own side? or would it be right to tell these criminals, that the law, if enforced at all for the protection of the persons and property of those who differed from them in opinion, would be enforced only grudgingly, as the performance of a very ungrateful task?

Sir Charles Wetherell maintained that the meeting, to whose votes of thanks lord Althorp and lord J. Russell had returned answers, was in itself an illegal meeting. He defied the lawyers on the other side of the House—if there were any lawyers there—to deny that a meeting of 150,000 persons, assembling together with symbols of concert, was guilty of a misdemeanour. He had lord Holt's authority for saying, that "an army of people, consisting of unusual numbers, congregated together, is a terror, and, as it were, an assault upon the people"—and still less could any man deny that, for a number of persons to agree and conspire to refuse payment of taxes was to be guilty of a very grave offence. Yet it was with the chairman of such a meeting, pledging itself to such an agreement and conspiracy, that ministers had been corresponding. The chancellor of the Exchequer, indeed, had told the people of Birmingham not to commit acts of violence, not to refuse to pay taxes—but for what reason? Not because such proceedings were contrary to law, and would be repressed by the law; but, forsooth, because they would tend to endanger the success of the reform

bill; and then lord J. Russell, with his milk and water executive government, talked of its being the duty of the administration to calm the people. He thought that noble lord might have used some stronger expression, when he heard of the violence and outrage which were going on out of doors, and the attacks made on peers because they did what the constitution authorized and required them to do. It was the duty of government not merely to talk of calming the people, but to punish and repress these outrages, and put the law in force against every person who excited to violence. But it was his idea, that the government had long connived at those attacks on the constitutional authority of the state which the newspapers were dealing out, as daily reports, to the people. Looking at the incessant provocations to violence and outrage which were allowed, all and each of them, to go unpunished, one would think that the office of Attorney-general was vacant. He did not accuse the noble paymaster of the forces of any wish to palliate those crimes; but he charged the noble lord and the government with taking no measures to suppress them. He had no confidence in the exertions of government to repress disturbances, and what was more, he did not believe that the public had. The public opinion was, that the government connived at these disturbances, as a means of carrying on the reform bill. He did not believe, that ministers would manfully and energetically use the legal and constitutional powers of government in repressing these scandalous and anti-social outrages. He repeated, that the conduct of government was



highly censurable in permitting attacks to be made not only on that, but on the other House of Parliament, in a publication which contained the most illegal threats of intimidation, at the propagation of which his majesty's ministers sedulously and industriously connived; and in his opinion there was but little difference in point of responsibility between the principal in any proceeding and the conniver. He begged to remind the right hon. gentlemen opposite, that though the duke of Newcastle's property was burning to-day, to-morrow Woburn Abbey, and Knowsley-house might be marked out for destruction.

Lord Althorp denied that he had written any letter to a body known under the name of the Birmingham Political Union. He had merely addressed a letter to the chairman of a meeting held at Birmingham, consisting of 150,000 persons, expressing his sense of a vote of thanks with which so large a number of his fellow countrymen had thought fit to honour his public conduct. He valued highly this testimony to his character; and he was not the man to disdain returning a courteous answer to such a communication, nor could he think that, in so doing, he had acted in a manner by any means unworthy of his station. In acknowledging to the chairman the honour thus conferred on him, he had taken the opportunity to recommend that gentleman to use his influence for the prevention of acts of violence, or illegal and unconstitutional excesses. He had also stated that the rejection of the reform bill was a great calamity, for as a calamity his colleagues and himself had considered it. But

how the letters of his noble friend and himself could be said to encourage riot, he was totally unable to divine.

Mr. Trevor mentioned as a specimen of the peaceable conduct, on that day, of those who were now lauded as the tranquil people, that he had witnessed the attack on the marquis of Londonderry at the very doors of the palace, where he had been struck down from his horse amid cries of "murder him," "cut his throat." Colonel Trench, too, said, he had followed the procession along Piccadilly. When they reached the House of the duke of Devonshire, the mob gave a great shout; and when they arrived at that of the duke of St. Alban's, they also gave a shout, but it was more feeble. When he got near the house of the duke of Wellington, he saw a number of respectable looking persons—persons very well dressed, walking four and four, and with ribands tied round their arms—leave the main body, while those who followed them rushed into the gate. Those well-disposed persons made room for the individuals whom they headed, and who immediately began breaking the windows. The mere breaking of a pane or two of glass, under ordinary circumstances, was of no importance; but this appeared to him to be a regular and organized outrage. He confessed that it gave him very great pain to find that any set of men could offer insult to an individual whose warlike achievements had immortalized the British name, and who he believed to be the most upright and honest man that ever ornamented private society or dignified public station. One individual there was whom he could



identify as giving orders. This individual was a remarkably well-dressed man. The well-dressed people, of whom he had already spoken as being present on the occasion, if not inciting to outrage, did not, at any rate, attempt to prevent it. It was a question on a former occasion whether these processions were legal or not: but he feared that the permission given in so many instances to such processions would take away all doubts on the subject from the minds of the people.

On the following day (Oct. 13) another angry discussion of the same topics took place on a motion of sir C. Wetherell, for an address to the crown, praying that a special commission might be issued, without delay, for the trial of the Nottingham rioters, which, however, sir Charles said, he would not press, if government would give an assurance that such a commission would be issued. Lord Althorp refused to give any such assurance, but he would give this assurance, that the property of every individual in the country would be protected, so far as government could protect it. The attorney-general stated that of the persons, who set fire to Nottingham-castle, unfortunately not one was yet in custody; so that if a special commission were to issue, there were no prisoners to try. Some persons, who had been seen wandering about the outskirts of the town, had been taken by the yeomanry. There were about 15 persons in custody, whose trials would be disposed of at the ensuing sessions. He felt convinced that no further outrages would take place in that quarter. When the first ebullition appeared at Nottingham, the cavalry were at Derby, where, he was sorry to say,

VOL. LXXIII.

greater outrages had been committed than at Nottingham, and before a sufficient force could be procured, unfortunately Nottingham-castle was burnt. The magistracy, however, of the town and the county had been active and alert, the yeomanry had been ordered out, a military force was brought to bear upon the rioters, and the respectable inhabitants were sworn in as special constables for the protection of the town. This had proved sufficient; the disturbances were checked, and the repetition of such outrages was now exceedingly improbable. Sir C. Wetherell allowed his amendment to be negatived, without dividing the House.

On October 3rd, the chancellor of the Exchequer laid before the House of Commons his view of the finances of the year. This was, in fact, the second statement within the year; but almost every part of the original budget had been exploded, and his lordship had necessarily been driven to change his intended operations. He now proceeded first to shew the difference between the revenue of the present and of the preceding year. The amount of the receipts under the head of customs, for the year 1830, had been 17,540,000*l*. Taking this as the calculation for 1831, in the quarter to the 24th of September, there had been a decrease of 644,000*l*., which reduced the amount to 16,896,000*l*. There was a further loss of 210,000*l*. from the reduction of the coal duties; but there was an increase on account of the duties on raw cottons and on wines of 100,000*l*., so that the nett amount of the customs was 16,786,000*l*., or he would take it at 16,750,000*l*. The excise duties for 1830 had amounted to 18,644,000*l*.; but, in calcula-

[U]



ting for 1831, there had been a decrease in the quarter, to the 24th of September, of 1,909,000*l.*; and he estimated a further loss of 100,000*l.* on the reduction of the beer duties, so that he took the excise at about 16,642,660*l.* To this he was to add the sum of 157,000*l.* received on the stock of wines in hand, so that the Excise duties for 1831 would amount to the sum of 16,800,000*l.* In the last two years taxes had been reduced by 3,357,000*l.* under the head of Excise. The reduction in the Customs had been 1,120,000*l.* The amount of reductions in these two branches in 1831 was 4,477,000*l.*, and the decrease in the receipts had been only 2,634,000*l.*, so that there had been a real increase of 1,842,293*l.* He should take the revenue of the present year as follows :

Customs	... ..	£16,750,000
Excise	... ..	16,800,000
Stamp duties	... ..	6,850,000
Taxes	... ..	5,000,000
Post-office	... ..	1,500,000
Miscellaneous	... ..	250,000
And a receipt from the hereditary revenue of Scotland of	... ..	100,000

---

Total ... £47,250,000

He would now proceed to the expenditure, and he felt himself fully justified in estimating what the expenditure would be. He should take it up to the 24th of September, at ... .. £35,221,643

For the remainder of the year ... .. 11,534,578

---

Total for the year £46,756,221.

He had to allow for 200,000*l.* more received from the account of the last year, so that he would take the surplus of revenue over expenditure at 493,000*l.* He felt con-

fident that he did not make any exaggerated statement, and he begged leave to observe, that the surplus was larger than he had anticipated in February last, notwithstanding he had not succeeded in carrying several of the taxes he had proposed. In the present quarter there had been a falling-off in the customs, but he had every reason to believe that it would not continue. In regard to the sinking fund he had acted thus:—at the commencement of each quarter, he had taken an average of the four preceding quarters, and that sum he had applied to the reduction of the debt in the succeeding quarter, if the revenue, at least, was not manifestly falling. The act allowed the commissioners for the reduction of the national debt to apply the surplus revenue to the purchase of exchequer bills, or deficiency bills, as well as stock, and since the revenue had been diminished so much by the reduction of taxes, the surplus had been applied in the purchase of deficiency bills of the Bank. He had acted in this manner in order to diminish the number of securities in the hands of the Bank: and although the plan was operose, the effect was, that the debt was not reduced, unless there was a real surplus of revenue.

On the 20th of October, the king in person prorogued Parliament with the following speech:—

“My Lords and Gentlemen,

“I am at length enabled to put an end to a session of unexampled duration and labour, in which matters of the deepest interest have been brought under your consideration.

“I have felt sincere satisfaction in confirming by my Royal assent bills for the amendment of the game laws, and for the reduction



of taxes which pressed heavily on the interests of my people ; and I have observed with no less pleasure the commencement of important improvements in the law of bankruptcy, from which the most beneficial effects may be expected.

“ I continue to receive the most gratifying proofs of the friendly disposition of Foreign Powers.

“ The Conference assembled in London has at length terminated its difficult and laborious discussions, by an arrangement unanimously agreed upon by the plenipotentiaries of the five Powers for the separation of the states of Holland and Belgium, on terms by which the interests of both, together with the future security of other countries, have been carefully provided for.

“ A treaty founded on this arrangement has been presented to the Dutch and Belgian plenipotentiaries, and I trust that its acceptance by their respective Courts, which I anxiously expect, will avert the dangers by which the peace of Europe was threatened whilst this question remained unsettled.

“ Gentlemen of the House of Commons,

“ I thank you for the provision made for the future dignity and comfort of my royal consort, in the event of her surviving me ; and for the supplies which you have granted for the service of the present year. You may be assured of my anxious care to have them administered with the strictest attention to a well-considered economy.

“ The state of Europe has made it necessary to incur in the various establishments of the public service an increased expenditure, which it will be my earnest desire to re-

duce, whenever it can be done with safety to the interests of the country. In the mean time I have the satisfaction of reflecting that these demands have been provided for without any material addition to the public burthens.

“ My Lords and Gentlemen,

“ In the interval of repose which may now be afforded to you, I am sure it is unnecessary for me to recommend to you the most careful attention to the preservation of tranquillity in your respective counties. The anxiety which has been so generally manifested by my people for the accomplishment of a constitutional reform in the Commons' House of Parliament, will, I trust, be regulated by a due sense of the necessity of order and moderation in their proceedings.

“ To the consideration of this important question the attention of parliament must necessarily again be called at the opening of the ensuing Session ; and you may be assured of my unaltered desire to promote its settlement by such improvements in the representation as may be found necessary for securing to my people the full enjoyment of their rights, which, in combination with those of the other orders of the state, are essential to the support of our free constitution.”

Parliament was then prorogued to the 22nd November, and subsequently, by proclamation, to the 6th of December.

Throughout the reform debates in the House of Commons, the bill had encountered from no one a more unyielding and distinguished opposition than from sir Charles Wetherell. Sir Charles was recorder of Bristol. He proceeded to that city on Saturday the 29th October to discharge his judicial



duty by opening the king's commission on the following Monday. He was received as usual by the civic bodies, but a reforming populace likewise awaited his approach, to make him the object of their violence and insult. As he entered the city, the rabble assailed the recorder with all possible expressions of dislike; and stones were thrown at his carriage, and at the constables who attended it. Accompanied by this outrageous rabble, the cavalcade reached the Guild Hall, into which likewise the populace made their way. The royal commission was read, and the further proceedings adjourned till the following Monday, amid wild clamour and uproar. The recorder and the municipal authorities then proceeded to the Mansion-house, where, according to custom, they were to dine. On his way he was greeted with the same continuance of groans and hisses from the populace, except at the Commercial Rooms, where stood an assemblage of more respectable citizens, who hailed them with three cheers. They arrived in safety at the Mansion-house: the crowd filled the square: stones began to fly; and some windows were broken. The constables seized, or attempted to seize, some of the delinquents. The mob armed themselves with sticks and bludgeons; but the constables, by a simultaneous attack, drove them back. They still, however, kept possession of the square, and continued to discharge their missiles at the police and the windows. So little was more serious danger apprehended, that a large division of the constables was allowed to retire. The mob, seeing themselves opposed by a smaller force, became more bold. The mayor came for-

ward, entreating them to disperse, as he must otherwise call out the military. Their violence only increased. The riot-act was read: the reply to it was an instantaneous attack upon the constables, who were overpowered, disarmed, and driven from the ground. The Mansion-house itself was then stormed; the doors were forced; the sashes and shutters of the windows torn down; the furniture on the ground-floor demolished; the iron palisades were converted into weapons, and preparations were made for firing the building.

The recorder and magistrates had escaped by the back of the Mansion-house, and murder was prevented. The recorder immediately left the city: the magistrates ordered out the military, consisting of two troops of cavalry. The latter walked their horses about among the mob, to whom the commanding officer gave fair words. They would not disperse: no attempt was made effectually to disperse them: they were allowed to remain, after all the crimes they had committed, in possession of the square, in the face of the law, and of the military force which had been brought there to enforce the law. They proceeded to break the windows of the Council-house. The cavalry then charged, and drove them out of the square. They retreated into the bye streets and passages, from which they pelted the military with stones. Any farther mischief, however, was prevented during the night between Saturday and Sunday. But Sunday morning brought back the populace, greatly increased in numbers and daring, while the troops had been sent home to their barracks, although every thing prognosticated



a renewal of the disturbance. The mob again filled the Mansion-house : all its depositories, from top to bottom, were ransacked, and every article which it contained was carried off, or wantonly destroyed. What was worse, the populace made their way into the cellars, where they found a large stock of wines and spirits. These were next plundered, and to the common violence of a lawless mob was now added the reckless and brutal fury of intoxication. One troop of cavalry—a troop of the 14th—was called out. It so happened that this troop had been the most active in the discharge of its duty on the preceding evening, and was therefore fully as unpopular as the recorder. The mob attacked it with showers of stones and brick-bats, seriously wounding many of the men ; yet they did nothing : no magistrate gave orders to act, and the commanding officer seemed not to know that a soldier, when actually assaulted, and more especially when assaulted on duty, is entitled, like every other citizen, to put down the assailant, without the command of any magistrate. He acted still more madly : he attempted to coax and negotiate a truce with the mob : he asked them if they would be quiet, provided he withdrew this unpopular troop ! On an assurance to this effect, he ordered the 14th away. The mob followed all the way to their barracks, making upon them, with dangerous missiles, such violent attacks, that the men, at last, in self-defence, turned and fired.

The other troop replaced them at the Mansion-house, which was thus protected when there was no longer any thing to protect. But the drunken populace immediately

selected new objects : one detachment proceeded to the Bridewell ; arming themselves with sledge-hammers from a neighbouring smith's shop, which they broke open, they battered down the gates, rushed into the interior, liberated all the prisoners, and then set fire to the building. This was about two o'clock on Sunday, and not the slightest molestation was offered to their proceedings, a troop of cavalry being kept, in the meantime, useless in its barracks, merely because it had done its duty. The consequences were inevitable. The unresisted mob, increased in numbers and security, attacked the new jail, while thousands looked on. They carried and gutted the governor's house, made their way into the yard, armed with hammers to break open the doors : all the prisoners—criminals as well as debtors—were forthwith set at liberty, amid the exulting shouts of the populace ; and the jail, being thus emptied, was immediately set on fire, with all its adjuncts of tread-mill, chapel, and governor's house. While the liberation of the prisoners was going on, and before the conflagration had commenced, but when the jail was in the possession of the rioters, a party of the troop of the 3rd guards, which had replaced the unpopular troop at the Mansion-house, appeared on the ground. The mob cheered the military ; the military acknowledged the compliment, wheeled round, and marched off. The rioters leaving the jail burning, and setting fire, on their way, to various toll-houses, next carried, without resistance, the Gloucester county prison, liberated its inmates, and then set it on fire—sending off a detachment to aid the conflagration of



the Bridewell, one wing of which seemed otherwise likely to escape. It was now Sunday afternoon. The Bridewell, the new jail, and the county jail, were all burning at the same time. No man dared to bring assistance; no force, civil or military, was interfering with the populace; and the rioters were masters of the city: the government of the mob had begun.

The reformers in parliament and out of parliament had held up as objects of hatred and contempt the bishops of the church of England, because they had voted against a bill believed by them to be utterly ruinous to a church of which they were the heads. The Bristol mob-reformers, therefore, proceeded next to attack the bishop's palace. They effected an entrance, but were stopped by the appearance of the military, who had been hastily called away from the Mansion-house. The mob, which remained in the square before the Mansion-house, again entered it, and in an instant it was in flames; the drunken rioters, as they fired the apartments one after another, cheering from the front windows at the progress of their unopposed triumph. The solitary troop of the guards hastened back to the Mansion-house from the bishop's palace. The episcopal dwelling was immediately in a blaze, and was soon a heap of ashes. The bishop himself had tranquilly performed all the clerical duties of the day, and had then withdrawn from the fury of the miscreants.

The unresisted rioters now crowded back to Queen square, to exult in the conflagration of the mansion house, and extend the flames. They set fire to the houses round the square, one after another, having first plundered them.

They reached the Custom-house, an immense building, left utterly unprotected. Its whole extent was forthwith added to the burning mass. It was now mid-night; and Monday morning was hailed by proceeding to another side of the square. The first building there was the Excise-office. It shared, unprotected and unresisted, the fate of the Custom-house. The adjacent buildings were next set on fire, and the unrestrained flames extended to the houses in the neighbourhood.

The frightful extent of this unchecked destruction recalled the magistrates and the military officers to some sense of duty in the course of Monday morning. The unpopular troop of cavalry was again ordered to appear, and soon succeeded in clearing the streets. The magistrates, too, called out their *posse*, and received the aid of all good citizens. New troops were poured into the town. The rioting was over, and at length fire-engines were brought forth to extinguish the dying embers of destroyed buildings. Before Tuesday, the 1st November, order had been restored, and the police were busily occupied in recovering the stolen property, and apprehending the criminals. Several of the latter had lost their lives, but only few of them from the operations of the military. The greater number of those who perished did so, in consequence of intoxication disabling them from escaping from the flames which they themselves had kindled. The property destroyed was estimated at nearly half a million.\*

---

\* The following was the return published of the killed and wounded:—

<i>Dead.—At the Infirmary.</i>				
From shots	..	..	..	2
sword cuts	..	..	..	1



Since the riots in London commonly called Lord George Gordon's riots, no part of the United Kingdom had exhibited such scenes. The reformers laid the blame of all that had happened on sir C. Wetherell. He knew, they said, or he ought to have known, that he was hateful to the people of Bristol as an anti-reformer, and he ought not to have provoked them by appearing amongst them. In the very same breath, they declared most clamorously that the people

burnt .. .. .	1
excessive drinking ..	1
<i>At St. Peter's Hospital.</i>	
From sword cuts .. ..	1
burnt .. .. .	5
excessive drinking ..	1
<hr/>	
Total .. ..	12

*Wounded and Injured.—At the Infirmary.*

From shots .. .. .	8
sword cuts and contusions from the horses of the military ..	30
other causes unconnected with the military .. ..	21
apoplexy from excessive drinking ..	2
<i>At St. Peter's Hospital.</i>	
From sword cuts .. ..	2
other causes .. ..	2
<i>At the Dispensaries and the Houses of Private Surgeons.</i>	
From shots .. .. .	2
sword cuts .. .. .	16
other causes .. ..	11
<hr/>	
Total .. ..	94

*Total.—Wounded and Injured.*

From shots .. .. .	10
sword cuts .. .. .	48
drunkenness .. .. .	2
other causes .. .. .	34
<hr/>	
Total .. ..	94

The body of a boy, and parts of several other bodies, found among the ruins in the square, were taken to St. Peter's Hospital, in addition to those included in the above list.

of Bristol had no concern in the outrages, and that what had happened was no consequence of any reform spirit. More sober men asked,—‘Is it true, then, that a judge of the land is not to be allowed to perform the high duties of his office, because he differs from us in political opinion? Was the fact of the recorder of Bristol being an anti-reformer any good reason for placing him beyond the pale of the law, and setting the city in flames? Do we reformers conciliate the good-will of good citizens by shewing that such conduct is that in which our followers love to find their gratification? Or, if those outrages had nothing to do with the opinions and practices of reformers, if those by whom they were perpetrated are not to be considered as ranking among reformers, and if we say that no such crimes were to be dreaded from reformers, what do we mean by saying that an anti-reforming judge should have deserted his duty, and not ventured into reforming Bristol, where, according to our account of ourselves and our doctrines, no disturbance was to be dreaded from reformers?’ Nevertheless, the reforming journals daily poured forth their obloquy on sir C. Wetherell, until they were all at once silenced by the discovery that he had gone down to Bristol only after consulting the government, and after receiving the sanction of his majesty's ministers that there was no impropriety in his proceeding to fulfil the duties of his judicial station. To have sought that sanction may have been prudent; but in what times do men live, when a judge of the land must suspend the duties of his office at the command of prepared and banded criminals! On



the 3rd of December, a special commission was issued for the trial of the rioters, and on the 20th, similar commissions issued to try the rioters at Nottingham and Derby.

The political unions now became bolder, and it was determined, in order to give greater unity to their proceedings to give them a central point by forming in London, a "National Political Union." The meeting was held in Lincoln's-inn-fields on the 31st of October, and Sir Francis Burdett took the chair. After the usual speeches, it was resolved that a National Political Union should be formed, to be guided by a council, to which should be intrusted, in the first place, the formation of its rules; that it should give its assistance in the formation of branch unions, and that the chairman of a branch union, so soon as he became a member of the national union, should be a member of the council. Some discord was raised among these legislators by a proposal that a certain part of the council should consist of persons from the working classes. Sir Francis Burdett opposed this, ostensibly because it assumed a distinction of classes to exist, having separate interests. There were, to be sure, rich and poor, but they all formed only one class, the people of England. But the friends of the lower orders would not be so satisfied. The middle classes, said a workman, merely wish to make us the tools of their purposes; we are not even to have votes, and they tell us it would be impolitic now to demand that. There is no use in preaching up policy and patience, when we are starving; it is a mockery of us. If the middle classes be really sincere, they should take care

that the working classes were better clothed and fed. If that be the end of reform, then we may unite with them, but they rather seek policy and expediency. There should be a resolution that the National Union would never cease its efforts, till complete enfranchisement was obtained for every man capable of bearing arms; and the middle class must recognize this principle, if they wished the working classes to unite with them. This resolution was not adopted, but the matter was compromised by its being carried that the half of the council of the National Political Union should be composed of members of the working classes. Sir F. Burdett shortly afterwards withdrew his name from the association. Perhaps he thought there was too strong an intermixture of the democratic principle.

The working classes having thus acquired a *persona standi* proceeded to action. They had their own Union, and its office-bearers called a general meeting of the working classes, to be held at White Conduit House, on the 7th November, to ratify a bill of rights which they publicly put forth. This document, besides demanding universal suffrage, annual parliaments, and vote by ballot, declared "That all property *honestly acquired*, is sacred and inviolable; that all men are born equally free, and have certain natural and unalienable rights; *that all hereditary distinctions of birth are unnatural, and opposed to the equal rights of man, and ought to be abolished;*" and they declared that they would never be satisfied with any law or laws which stopped short of these principles. They called, likewise, on their fellow-workmen, in all parts of the country, to meet for



the same purpose, on the same day. This proclamation was accompanied with certain very eloquent facts. Information was given that, in the neighbourhood of Bethnal-green, an immense number of staves, with the tri-colour device painted on them, had been sold; that sticks with concealed swords were in the market, and that the stick-shops had been exposed to a demand for bludgeons which they could scarcely supply. Government became alarmed. Orders were given to swear in special constables in the different parishes: the whole police force was ordered to be in readiness; a very large body of troops, both infantry, and cavalry, were drawn round London; military and cannon were stationed in the different prisons. Still, however, government did not prohibit the meeting; the only warning came from the magistrates of Hatton-garden, who, on the 5th, issued a notice, stating that the intended meeting would be seditious and illegal, and strictly enjoining all loyal and well-disposed subjects to refrain from attending it. Thereupon a deputation of the working classes repaired to the Home Secretary. Lord Melbourne admitted them to an interview. He told them that their declaration was not only highly seditious, but perhaps treasonable, and that any person attending the meeting with the object for which it was professedly called, would be guilty of an act of treason. The leaders of the plot then agreed to abandon the meeting; but no step was taken against them either for their seditious publications, or for their misdemeanour in calling such a meeting.

On the 22nd of November a proclamation was at length issued, de-

signed to give a check to the spirit of political combination. It proceeded on the statement that "certain of our subjects in different parts of our kingdom have recently promulgated plans for voluntary associations, under the denomination of Political Associations, to be composed of separate bodies, with various divisions and sub-divisions, under leaders with a gradation of ranks and authority, and distinguished by certain badges, and subject to the general control and direction of a superior committee or council, for which associations no warrant has been given by us, or by any appointed by us, on that behalf: and according to the plans so promulgated, as aforesaid, a power appears to be assumed of acting independently of the civil magistrates, to whose requisition calling upon them to be enrolled as constables the individuals composing such associations are bound, in common with the rest of our subjects to yield obedience." It described such associations as being incompatible with the performance of the duty of subjects, at variance with the acknowledged principles of the constitution, and subversive of his majesty's authority as supreme head of the State. The proclamation therefore declared, "all such associations, so constituted and appointed as aforesaid, to be unconstitutional and illegal," and commanded all the lieges to abstain from joining them. The royal proclamation called forth a declaration of the newly constituted National Union "that the proclamation does not apply to the National Political Union, nor to the great majority of Unions now in existence." Excepting that the Birmingham Union abandoned a proposed plan of organization,



things remained as they were. The proclamation may have prevented the spread of a spirit of affiliation, connected action, and graduated control, and that, perhaps, in the existing state of the law, was all that a proclamation could do. The existing unions continued, new ones were created, and no check was given to the weight with which these pseudo-parliaments pressed upon the government of the country.

Towards the end of the year the cholera morbus made its appearance in the north of England. Whether the malady known by this name was contagious or epidemic, was a matter on which there had been much discussion; but, though the cause of the disease and its laws of transmission could not be satisfactorily explained, its history at least was, to a considerable extent, known. In August, 1817, a malady of a peculiar character made its appearance at Jessore, in Bengal. The first serious manifestations of it consisted generally in violent vomitings and discharges of the bowels; the evacuations presenting, for the most part, numerous mucous flakes floating in a liquid resembling rice-water or whey. Spasmodic contractions, beginning in the fingers and toes, gradually extended themselves to the trunk: the pulse sunk; the skin became cold; the lips, face, neck, hands, and feet, and soon after the thighs, arms, and whole surface assumed a leaden, blue, purple, black, or deep brown tint, according to the complexion of the individual, and varying in shade with the intensity of the attack. The fingers and toes were reduced in size; the skin and soft parts covering them became wrink-

led, shrivelled, and folded; the nails put on a blueish pearly white hue; the larger superficial veins were marked by flat lines of a deeper black; the pulse became either small as a thread, or else totally extinct; the voice sunk into a whisper; the respiration was quick, irregular, and imperfect; and the secretion of urine was totally suspended. Death took place often in ten or twelve, generally within eighteen or twenty hours, after the appearance of decided and well-formed symptoms. In the space of a few weeks 10,000 persons fell victims to this malady in the single district of Jessore. It soon extended its ravages throughout Bengal; few towns or villages in an area of several thousand miles escaped the invasion. The cities of Decca and Patna, the towns of Balasore, Burrishol, Burdavan, and Malda, suffered severely; and, throughout the Gangetic Delta, the mass of the population was sensibly diminished. It extended also eastward along the coast of the Asiatic continent, and through the islands of the Indian ocean, to China, and to Timor. In 1818, it appeared in Arracan; in 1819, in Penang, the island of Java, &c.; in Canton, in October, 1820; and in Pekin, in 1821. Before the end of 1823, it had traversed the Molucca islands and the island of Timor; and, continuing for several years to ravage the interior of China, it had, by 1827, passed to the north of the Great Wall, and desolated several places in Mongolia.

At the same time it was extending to the west as well as to the east. In 1818, it made its appearance at Bombay; and broke out anew in 1819, 1820, and 1821.



Ascending the Persian Gulph, it spread, on one hand, from Busheer into Persia; on the other, it passed through Bassora, along the course of the rivers Tigris and Euphrates into Asiatic Turkey. After traversing Baku and other ports on the western border of the Caspian sea, it appeared in Astracan in September, 1823, but died away in the course of the winter. It continued during the succeeding years to wander about in different provinces of Persia, and the adjacent districts; and, in 1830, it broke out with renewed violence on the western shores of the Caspian sea. It soon ravaged Georgia, and made its appearance in Astracan; thence it ascended the Volga, and crossed over to the Don, spreading northwards so as in the month of June to reach St. Petersburg and Archangel. Holding also a western course, and entering Poland, it broke out in Warsaw, in April, 1831; in Dantzic, in May; in Berlin, in the beginning of September; and in Hamburgh, in the month following. It made its appearance in Jassy, in June, 1831; in Bucharest and Pest, in July; and in Vienna, in September.

Precautions had been taken, by enforcing quarantine regulations, to protect Great Britain and Ireland from the malady. However, on the 26th of October, it made its appearance in Sunderland. It was alleged that, a few days previously, three vessels from Hamburgh had been allowed to pass up the river to perform quarantine above the harbour, and that their crews had held free communication with the shore: but there was no evidence of the

existence of the disease on board these ships. There was great contrariety of opinion among medical men. Some alleged, that the malady which had broken out at Sunderland was contagious, and identical with the Asiatic cholera; others asserted, that it was totally dissimilar, and was merely epidemic. This much, however, was certain, that a malady had made its appearance, presenting an assemblage of symptoms not hitherto observed in ordinary conjunction in this country; resembling, in their general character, the symptoms of the disease which had spread from Bengal to the Baltic, and accompanied with a degree of mortality, less indeed than had been experienced in most places which the cholera had assailed, but greatly surpassing the ordinary mortality of any similar ailment, with which medical practitioners here were previously acquainted. Between the 26th of October and the 28th of December, when only seven cases remained, 528 persons were attacked in Sunderland, of whom 197 died. In the beginning of December it spread to Newcastle; and, by the 28th of the month, ninety-nine had died out of 286 who were attacked. On Christmas day it made its appearance in Gateshead; and, within forty-eight hours, upwards of 120 cases occurred, of which fifty-two proved fatal. In the course of December North Shields, South Shields, Westoe, Houghton Le Spring, and Penther, were attacked; and, by the 28th of that month eight cases, out of which six were fatal, had occurred in Haddington, in Scotland.



## CHAP. X.

IRELAND.—*Lawless state of the Peasantry in Ireland—Distress of the Population—Associations in Dublin for a Repeal of the Union—O'Connell's intended Procession of the Trades prohibited by Proclamation—O'Connell summons his assemblies under a new name, and they are again prohibited by Proclamation—Proposal that O'Connell himself shall be declared to be an association—He renews his meetings in the shape of a Public Breakfast—The Breakfasts are prohibited by Proclamation—New devices of the agitators to evade the law, followed by another Proclamation—Partial run upon the banks—O'Connell convokes another meeting, which is dispersed by the Magistrates—O'Connell and his coadjutors apprehended for illegal proceedings—True Bills are found against them—He puts in a demurrer, then withdraws it, and pleads Not Guilty—Attempts to delay his Trial—Withdraws his plea, and pleads Guilty—Discussions in Parliament whether Government had made a compromise with the agitators—None of the agitators brought up for judgment—Declarations against a Repeal of the Union—Discussions in Parliament on the same subject—Continued disturbances in Ireland—Insurrection Act enforced by Proclamation in several counties, and Special Commission to try the offenders—Fatal collisions between the peasantry and the authorities at Castle Pollard—At Newton-barry—In county Kilkenny.*

**D**URING the discussion in parliament of the bill which extended to the Roman Catholics of Ireland all the civil rights enjoyed by their Protestant fellow subjects, it had been predicted by its opponents that the proposed concessions, instead of restoring peace and tranquillity to that portion of the empire, would only lead to new demands, to be enforced by the same instruments of agitation and defiance, the efficacy of which would have been proved by the very measure that was then in contemplation. The prediction was already verified. Instead of the re-appearance of any tolerable de-

gree of harmony and good will, submission to the law, and the prosecution of industrious labour, many parts of the country, and more particularly the southern counties, had become equally unsafe for property and for life. The peasantry set up their own uncontrolled law of force; they banded themselves in large bodies, as well as in small, but numerous, parties, to enforce it; and, to gain their ends, they shrunk from no deed of blood, whether perpetrated in more open riot, or by private assassination. They directed themselves against the tithes of the church, and the rents and property of the



laity. Marching armed to the residences of the clergy, they compelled them to reduce the legal rate of the tithes, or to abandon it altogether. Vengeance was denounced, by all manner of threatening notices, not only against the persons who should exact, but against the farmers who should pay, it; and the menaces were carried into execution by murder, rapine, and arson. In the face of day, under the eyes of the proprietor, and in defiance of all the resistance which the security of his life permitted him to make, they would cut down his trees in order to arm their bands with the weapons which were to be the instruments of new crimes. According to custom, wherever their more numerous assemblages were likely to come in contact with the military or police, they shrouded themselves under a legal covering: they had met to petition parliament, amuse themselves with some rustic and national game, or to celebrate a local festival—while their true occupation was, to arrange or execute schemes of lawless violence. By the month of December, 1830, the lord lieutenant was besieged by applications from the magistrates of different parts of the country, giving information that meetings of a mischievous tendency, under various pretexts of political discussion or of public amusement, were continually going on around them, and expressing the difficulties which they found in determining how to proceed in regard to them. The answer of the government was contained in a circular from the Irish secretary, which declared, that while government had no wish to interfere with the fair exercise of the right of petitioning, it was resolved to put

down every meeting which abused that right as a pretext for mischievous purposes.

“The law recognizes the fair and legitimate exercise of the right of petition; it acknowledges also the right of the people to meet for the purposes of innocent recreation, and protects them in the full and free exercise of that right. But the law does not warrant any assemblies having a manifest and direct tendency to a violation of the public peace, under whatsoever name, or for whatsoever professed purpose, they may be convened; and, therefore, any assemblies of persons, whether collected under the pretence of petitioning, or of public exhibitions of strength or skill, or under any other pretence whatsoever; if, from their numbers, acts, place, or times of meeting, or other circumstances preceding or accompanying them, they excite in the minds of his majesty’s well-disposed and peaceable subjects reasonable fear that the public peace will be thereby violated, and the lives or properties of the king’s subjects thereby endangered; or, if they be so constituted or conducted as to induce reasonable and well-founded apprehensions, that the motives and objects of the persons so assembling are not the fair and legal exercise of constitutional rights and privileges, but the accomplishment of alterations in the laws and constitution of the realm, by means of intimidation, and by demonstration of physical force, or by any other than legal and constitutional means; in these, and in all such like cases, such assemblies, however composed, or with whatsoever professed view collected, are illegal, and are, by the law, denominated ‘unlawful assemblies.’”



“And it is the duty of all magistrates, within whose jurisdiction such assemblies are called together (being first duly satisfied of their illegal nature), by all lawful means within their power to prevent such meetings, and to suppress and disperse them.”

The exposition of the law was clear enough; the difficulty lay in applying it. The very offence threw an obstacle in the way of punishment or prevention; for an active magistrate, like an obnoxious landlord, was not secure of his life for a single night. The exertions of the police and the magistrates placed no effectual restraint upon the population; illegal assemblages and atrocious crimes continued to disgrace the country. The peasantry marched in bands through the counties, demanding reduction of rents, and increase of wages; threatening destruction to the magistrates and gentry who should disobey, or endeavour to resist. In some instances, they called on the proprietors, at the peril of their lives and property, to meet at a certain time, and make regulations in accordance with these commands. In others, they deterred the tenants of the refractory proprietor from proceeding with their agricultural operations. In others, they insisted that no mode of agriculture should be used but that which should employ the greatest number of hands, such as spade-husbandry. In the county of Meath, they marched from house to house, taking the labourers from their work, and the horses from the plough; and so soon as the military had dispersed an assemblage at one point, a new one started up at another. Arms were procured by breaking into houses during the night, and com-

PELLING the inmates to surrender the weapons without which no man in Ireland was safe. Murder was not spared. In the month of January, a Mr. Blood, in the county of Clare, was murdered by ruffians introduced, for the purpose, by his own servants. About the middle of February, a Mr. Synge, who unfortunately had tenants upon church lands, whose demands were very different from his rights, was pierced with four bullets in the neighbourhood of his own house: and only a week afterwards, a magistrate in the county of Tipperary was murdered by a band who entered his house to search for arms.

To the alarm which these disorders spread among the better classes of society, was added, in many places, great distress among the lower. In the country as well as in the large towns, crowds were famishing for want of food, and sinking into bodily sickness from want of clothing during the inclemency of the winter. In only two baronies of the county of Mayo there were stated to be, by the middle of February, upwards of twenty thousand persons, without any visible means of procuring food. The potatoe crop had failed all along the western coast of Ireland, and it was estimated that in that district of the island there would almost immediately be at least 200,000 persons in want of food, and of the means of obtaining it. This miserable distress was by no means confined to Mayo, although it first appeared there in its most alarming degree. Much of it prevailed likewise in the counties of Galway and Sligo, and it gradually began to make its appearance in other parts of the island. Petitions were presented to parliament



praying for relief, and the chancellor of the Exchequer proposed a vote of 50,000*l.* to be advanced to certain commissioners, who should lend it, on proper security, to be used in giving employment to the starving population, in making roads and similar public works.

This state of things furnished at once the materials and the causes of civil insubordination; and it was amid those scenes of piteous destitution and criminal excesses that the men, who arrogated to themselves the title of the true friends of Ireland, prosecuted their schemes for dislocating the whole state of society, and interrupting the relations which enable all its ranks to contribute to the well-being of each of the others. While the peasantry were agitating in the counties, by crimes of all degrees of atrocity, the more distinguished disciples of that creed were pursuing the same object in Dublin, justifying, by their example, the disregard of law, in which all those miseries had their origin. The rustic agitators, nursed in ignorance, and often rendered desperate by want, demanded the abolition of tithes, the reduction of rents, and the increase of wages: the Dublin agitators, blessed with education, living in comfort, and some of them in luxury, held up tithes as a cruel persecution, and landlords as tyrannical hard-hearted oppressors, and demanded, in effect, that in their own hands should be deposited all the powers of government. The men who had thrown Ireland into confusion, and brought her to the borders of rebellion, to gain the privilege of being eligible to the parliament of the united kingdom, now extended their views

to higher objects. They demanded that that parliament should be destroyed: they insisted on a repeal of the union between Britain and Ireland; they clamoured as loudly that a separate legislature was essential to the welfare of the latter, as they had clamoured for the removal of their civil disabilities. There was nothing unnatural in the progress which they were thus making: it was the point to which Irish demagogues and a Catholic priesthood necessarily tended. Irish demagogues were lost or diluted in the large mass of the united parliament, but would be powerful potentates in an Irish house of commons, created and controlled by their own furious partizans. The Popish hierarchy, even if it should be able to return only Catholics from Ireland, could never hope to wield to its own purposes the Protestant House of Commons of the united empire; but its influence would be immeasurable over an Irish house of commons which, now that the exclusion of Catholics was removed, would be a Catholic house of commons, armed with power, and animated with inclination, to bring down a heavy though a late punishment on the heresies of the Church of England, and to build up the ruined altars, and restore once more the gorgeous omnipotence of their own infallible hierarchy.

The declared object of the agitators, therefore (for in that appellation the demagogues of Ireland now gloried), was the repeal of the Union; agitation was once more the instrument to be employed, and Mr. O'Connell was again the great agitator. He proceeded at once to parade in the eyes of government the physical force



which he was about to direct, the accumulation of ignorant passion by which he was to produce his irresistible confusion. It was announced that the trades of Dublin were to march through the streets of the city, on the 27th December (1830), in solemn procession, in honour of Mr. O'Connell; that is, that the streets of a peaceful city were to be occupied by a body of many thousand men, banded together in regular array for a political object, and possessing the power, if they should think fit to exercise it, of wrapping the capital in plunder and confusion. Ireland, more fortunate in this respect, than some other parts of the empire, possessed, in the act for the suppression of dangerous assemblies and associations, the means of repressing this form of the mischief. By virtue of the powers which that act vested in him, the Lord Lieutenant issued a proclamation, on the 25th of December, prohibiting the intended procession, on the ground that it was "calculated to lead to a disturbance of the public peace, and had excited serious apprehensions thereof in the minds of his Majesty's peaceable subjects, and that language of a highly inflammatory nature had been used by some of the persons who had signified their intention to attend."

The populace, who were thus to be deprived of their raree-show, and the great showman himself, immediately met, to deliberate whether it would be safe and prudent to set the government at defiance. O'Connell advised the mob to obey the proclamation, while he told them above all things to condemn it. He assured them that the repeal of the Union was inevitable, if they would only

obey the law, and he left them in no doubt as to what he meant by "obeying the law." They were to proceed to agitate precisely as they had done in the cause of emancipation; and all the world knew what was that honest obedience to the law which had induced a reluctant cabinet "to break in upon the Protestant constitution of the empire." "At one time," said he, "Catholic emancipation was far more hopeless, in appearance, than is the repeal. However, the united force of a class achieved that measure—the united force of a people will achieve the other. By force I mean the force of opinion, the force of reason, the force of justice: physical force we abhor and abjure. By agitation, Ireland has obtained civil and religious freedom—by agitation we have escaped an increase of taxation—by agitation we have prevented the abolition of the vice-royalty, and by agitation we will obtain a repeal of the Union. It is idle to talk of our being governed by a foreign parliament. My object in seeking a repeal of the Union is, to make—to induce every man who has property in Ireland—or receives pensions or salaries out of our taxes, to spend his income at home. If the people continue to obey my counsel—to follow my advice—I promise them to have, before three months, established some club or society in Dublin as will make the English government restore to us our rights." At the end of many three months, this promise was as far from being recollected or fulfilled, as any of the thousand other promises with which he practised on the gullibilities of his gaping and believing rabble. In place of the intended procession, it was



resolved that two deputies from each of the trades should march to his house, and there deliver to him their complimentary address. This limited exhibition was allowed to take place. O'Connell snuffed up the vulgar incense, and replied to his worshippers, "You are now petty, paltry, provincial slaves; but, with the help of God, and the will of good men, you shall be free, and agitation shall never be put down till the king's speech is pronounced by an Irish lord lieutenant in the parliament-house in College-green. I am one of the trades; and my trade is agitation."

But O'Connell, like every other artizan, could do nothing in his trade without his tools. The essential tools of an agitator are assemblages of blind and unreasoning men. Thinking that by avoiding processions he would evade the charge of endangering the public peace, he convoked his followers to make arrangements for forming a society, to be styled "*The General Association of Ireland for the Prevention of Unlawful Meetings, and for the Protection and Exercise of the sacred Right of Petitioning for the Redress of Grievances,*" an appellation which might be privileged in an Irishman, but which, when translated into English, meant an association for the prevention of its own Meetings. O'Connell seemed to be weak enough to believe that, by assuming, in words, so laudable a character, he would prevent the law from reaching the substantial mischief of his mob assemblages. Every person who chose was to become a member of this society, on payment of five shillings; and it was to hold its first meeting so soon as 100 members had

entered, which was sure to be the work of a few minutes. These preparations were made on the 6th of January: on the 7th the Lord Lieutenant issued a proclamation, setting forth that this new society, "under the shift and device of preventing unlawful meetings, and protecting the right of petitioning, had been really established for the purpose of intimidating the magistracy of Ireland, and controlling the exercise of lawful authority, and for other dangerous purposes; that the existence of such an association was dangerous to the public peace, and inconsistent with the due administration of the law." The proclamation, therefore, prohibited "the meeting of the said association, assembly, or body of persons; and all adjourned, renewed, or continued meetings of the same, or of any part thereof, under any name, pretext, or device whatsoever."

The government and O'Connell were now at issue on the question, whether the former would be able effectually to follow him through the subterfuges and windings by which he sought to evade the law, or whether he was to succeed in setting at defiance its spirit and object, under a hypocritical respect to its words. The ministry, having gone so far, could not now be foiled without disgrace. The first idea of the agitator, when he found himself thus resisted, was a singular one. He assembled the elite of his friends; one bond of union among whom was, their being subscribers to what was called the Parliamentary Intelligence Office; he denounced the proclamation as an act of despotism—a new crime against the country; and he proposed that he himself should be declared to be in his own person



an Irish association. "I propose," said he, "that the association intended to have been formed for the prevention of illegal meetings, and protecting the exercise of the right of petition, stand dissolved, and that I act in the place of that association. I substitute myself for that society, because the law cannot reach me as an individual. I appoint Mr. Dwyer my secretary, and I tell the people to submit to the law. Before they go to any meeting where they intend to petition parliament, let five of the steadiest amongst them be appointed, who can speak to any magistrate about to disperse them; let them say to him, "If you, sir, are going to disperse our meeting, only send in a policeman, send in an unarmed child, so that he will lay his hand on each individual, we will all part quietly." Let this be done, and it will be followed by 500 actions against the magistrate. I am quite ready, and will try the question with them. They may try to put us down by proclamation, but they cannot disperse me. I will be the *Pacificator* of Ireland. [*Cheers*] I will put a letter in the public newspapers, calling upon any person who chooses to pay 5s. to Mr. Dwyer—for I will not take more—and with this money I think I shall be able to protect the right of petitioning. The people will have Protestant and Catholic attornies enough. Thus, individually, I shall be able to do that which otherwise a society would have performed. We must also have two new societies: one a club, to meet at Home's, to look to all matters connected with elections, and which will take care that no men be returned to parliament but those who are anti-

unionists; the second is a society, in the words of the marquis of Anglesea to Mr. Kertland, "to discuss the merits of the Union question, and petition thereupon."

Mr. O'Connell was now a corporation sole; but notwithstanding this metaphorical multiplication of character, he was only one man, while there could be no successful agitation without plans adopted and arranged by numbers, to act upon numbers greater still, and without assemblages to fill the public ear, keep up public attention, and give the cause importance in the public eye. He and his friends, therefore, transferred their discussions to a meeting which they were in the habit of holding, once a week, at a hotel in Dublin. A public breakfast was the pretext of their assembling at Home's hotel, but the arrangement and furtherance of their anti-union schemes, and turbulent politics formed their true object, and their sole and serious occupation. From this subterfuge, too, they were forthwith driven. The Lord Lieutenant issued a proclamation, on the 10th of January, setting forth "that a body of persons has been in the habit of meeting weekly at a place in the city of Dublin called Home's Hotel; and that the said assembly has been designed, and the meeting thereof held, for the purpose of disseminating seditious sentiments, and of exciting among his majesty's subjects disaffection against the administration of the law, and the constituted authorities of the realm," and prohibiting the further meeting of that body, or any part of it, under any name or device whatsoever. On the same day O'Connell put forth his proclamation, in the form of a "letter to the people of Ireland," advis-



ing them to obey the Lord Lieutenant, although he had great difficulty in restraining his indignation "at living in an enslaved nation, where a proclamation is law. Another act of legal despotism has been committed. We are the bound slaves of a power created by law, and which, therefore, should be submitted to. A single Englishman can, in this our native land, dictate to us. He can use the most false and audacious calumnies with impunity; but, above all things, his will is made the arbiter of our conduct. Another proclamation has been issued by the veracious Lord Anglesey: he has prohibited breakfasts at Home's. 'This veracious Lord Anglesey's proclamation must be obeyed. Let us obey it readily—let no man breakfast at Home's. Alas! poor Home! But at breakfast, dinner, and supper, let every Irishman recollect that he lives in a country where one Englishman's will is law.' Nothing certainly could match the assurance of this man, in advising his countrymen to obey the law, while every act of his, which called forth the repeated exertions of legal authority, was a defiance of the law, not mended by being wrapt in the flimsy and paltry disguise of an attempted evasion of the law.

Accordingly he followed up his advice to obey the law, by immediately proceeding to disregard it. The objects which were to have been compassed by the prohibited association were transferred to other meetings, and new ones were formed, still the same in substance, but differing in name. The government, not yet wearied out, pounced upon them all at one fell swoop. A proclamation was issued on the 13th of January, which stated

that "an association, assembly, or body of persons assuming the following denominations, or some of them, that is to say, 'The Society of the Friends of Ireland of all Religious Persuasions;' 'The Irish Society for Legal and Legislative Relief, or the Anti-union Association;' 'The Association of Irish Volunteers for the Repeal of the Union;' 'The General Association of Ireland for the Prevention of Unlawful Meetings, and for the Protection and Exercise of the Sacred Right of Petitioning for the Redress of Grievances;' 'The Subscribers to the Parliamentary Intelligence-office, Stephen-street;' and other designations, have from time to time held meetings at different places in the city of Dublin, for the purpose of promulgating and circulating seditious doctrines and sentiments, and have endeavoured, by means of inflammatory harangues and publications, to excite and keep alive in the minds of his majesty's subjects in Ireland a spirit of disaffection and hostility to the existing laws and government: that other meetings of the said association, assembly, or body of persons for such purposes, under the aforesaid designations, or some of them, or some other name or names, and under various pretexts and devices, are intended to be held:" and it prohibited, under any name, or in any shape whatever, the meeting of the said association, assembly, or body of persons, government being determined to suppress the same.

The proclamation was followed, next day, according to custom, by a manifesto of Mr. O'Connell to his fellow-countrymen. He seemed to be now visited with awkward misgivings regarding his success in this contest of lawless usurpation



with legal and necessary authority, and the blindness of his wrath hurried him on towards projects still more extravagant. He submitted to the people the propriety of ruining themselves, destroying credit, and throwing the country into confusion, by making a sudden run upon the banks for gold. "The object of this proclamation," said he, "is to gag the Irish people; we are not deemed worthy of liberty of speech, and you will find, I am told, sage political hypocrites, and still more base and time-serving Catholics, to applaud the Algerine measures which would silence the voice of Ireland. It is said that one of the principal managers of the provincial bank in this country, in conjunction with the slavish Catholic of the bank of Ireland, has stipulated to support the despotic proclamation." He declared it necessary, therefore, to be prepared to punish these supposed delinquents, and all others of the same kind, by shaking their banks, suggesting that the concealed intention was, to attack the press, and put in motion the monied men who might have influence upon special juries. He told the people to wait to see whether the press should be assailed, which, in his mouth, meant, to see whether any notice would be taken of the libels and calumnies which he was every day disseminating against the government. "If that should take place, that instant I will use all the energies of my mind, and whatever influence I possess, to lessen the power of the paper makers, and produce a general gold currency. I do hope that if my fears are realized and the press shall be assailed, there will not be, in one week after, a single bank

note in circulation." Yet while he thus undisguisedly spoke of this atrocious absurdity as a mere instrument of political vengeance, he attempted to throw over it the protest of a deep conviction, "that it was essentially necessary for the permanent good of Ireland, that the present anomalous state of the currency should be corrected, and that England should not have the advantage of a gold circulation, while Ireland had only paper," not knowing, or rather wilfully forgetting, that when the small notes were withdrawn from circulation in England, it was the determined resistance of Scotland and Ireland which preserved them for these countries, as necessary to the proper support of credit, and the beneficial course of their mercantile transactions.

It was clear that even if this extravagant scheme had been practicable, its consequences would have been ruinous to those who were required to be the instrument of its execution. The interruption of all credit would have been followed by an interruption of all important branches of industry; every form of want and distress, which already stalked through Ireland, would have been multiplied and armed with new horrors. It is possible that O'Connell did not see these consequences; but it is likewise perfectly possible that he saw, in the aggravated distress which must have thence arisen, only a new and prolific manufacture of the materials of that commotion and fermentation, on whose impure surface his vulgar and noisy popularity was to be floated along. However that might be, the very possibility of such an occurrence as he threatened began



immediately to produce its necessary effects. To some extent, but only amongst the ignorant, applications were made to the banks for gold. They were instantly complied with ; but the banks, at the same time, both from its being impossible to foretel how far these demands might go, and to take the best means of stopping them, immediately restricted their discounts, or refused them altogether. A sort of panic ensued. It was not confined to Dublin, but spread to all parts of Ireland to which the threats and projects of the agitator reached. Merchants found themselves at once in as bad a condition as if their credit had been gone. The usual transactions of buying and selling were interrupted, and even the country people did not remain long ignorant of the mischief, when they suddenly found themselves compelled to carry back from Dublin, Limerick, or Kilkenny, the productions which they had brought to market. The banks, in the mean time, stood firm, no apprehension was entertained. The gentry in some of the counties put forth circulars, condemning the panic which had gone abroad, and declaring themselves as willing to take bank notes from their tenantry as ever. The merchant, shopkeeper, artizan and labourer were equally involved in embarrassment ; there was an instant stagnation in trade ; a rapid decline in the value of all articles of consumption, including provisions and agricultural produce, on which Ireland is so very dependent. The effects opened the eyes of all the world to the absurdity of the project. Every man saw and felt that the injury was done, not to the banks, but to the people, and that the proposed

measure instead of shaking the stability of the former, only diminished the resources, and hampered or ruined, the business of the latter. In the course of ten days the panic was no more, the demand for gold had ceased, and confidence was restored. In one respect it had done good, by shaking in many persons their blind confidence in their great leader. All the anti-unionists who depended on other professions than agitation, were wroth at his blindness and ignorance. A few days afterwards he proposed another scheme of a similar character, viz. that the government should be compelled to surrender, by all Ireland refusing to consume exciseable commodities ; but the proposition came too soon after his other experiment in political economy, to produce any effect.

In one of his addresses to the people, after the proclamation of the 13th of January had been issued, he affirmed that it went beyond the law ; that it was an exercise of despotic authority which the law had not vested in any person ; that it was in itself an impeachable offence, and that the moment he saw "a popular House of Commons," he would bring it before that House, with a view to salutary punishment. Notwithstanding the proclamation, therefore, he convoked another meeting, but instead of doing so manfully, like a person who is determined to assert a legal right against lawless power, he tried another of his sneaking subterfuges. An assembly merely for the purpose of petitioning was innocent ; and the new convocation was ostensibly a meeting of a committee of thirty-one persons, to make arrangements for a great aggregate assembly, at which a peti-



tion for the repeal of the Union was to be voted. This pretended committee, however, met, as it formerly had done, under the disguise of a public breakfast, and every person who chose to pay for his breakfast ticket was admitted. While O'Connell was haranguing concerning the proclamations, and the act of parliament in virtue of which they had been issued, two magistrates entered the room to disperse the meeting. By the statute a magistrate must give a meeting fifteen minutes to separate, after reading to them a certain notice therein prescribed; if any person remains longer, he may be imprisoned. O'Connell insisted that all the formalities should be observed, he took out his watch, and had some difference with the magistrate whether the notice had been given at eight or ten minutes past eleven. He employed the fleeting moments in assuring the magistrates that nobody then present had any connection with any of the societies mentioned in the proclamation, and in assuring his own friends, that the proceeding was utterly illegal, although it had the appearance of law. The fifteen minutes expired, and the meeting dispersed.

The only vent which he now found for his wrath and vituperation was in industriously attending the meetings held in different parishes and districts for the purpose of voting petitions for the repeal of the union, and he went into mourning for the fate of Ireland. A day or two after the dispersion of his last assemblage, he appeared at a meeting of some inhabitants of St. Thomas's parish, stripped of his ordinary emblem of faction, and wearing crape, which he had resolved not to lay aside till the re-

peal of "the Algerine act," the act, that is, which prevented him from assembling mobs to overawe the government. He again defied the government to put down agitation. "No, never while I live; and if to-morrow I were to go to the grave or to the scaffold, I will bequeath to my children eternal hatred of the Union. I have made a resolution to wear crape on my hat, till that most obnoxious act, under which our associations were put down, shall be repealed. I have resolved not to taste of any excisable article, till that event shall have taken place; and this very morning, when the tea and coffee were placed before me at breakfast I put them aside, and contented myself with milk." His leading disciples made themselves contemptible by similar fooleries. Mr. Lawless, when speaking at a meeting of the same kind, of a loyal address presented to the lord-lieutenant by the Dublin chamber of commerce, containing all the mercantile respectability of the capital, said, "we will beggar the rascals. Some of them are concerned in the whisky trade—we will not taste a drop of whisky; we will join a temperance society. There is no man more fond of a tumbler of punch than I am (a voice from the crowd cried, "Jack, I think you could take two,") but if they persevere, we will not take a sup." At the same meeting Mr. Sheil said, "If the Union is not repealed within two years, I am determined that I will pay neither rent, tithes, nor taxes. They may distrain my goods, but who'll buy, boys? that's the word—who'll buy? Mind, I don't tell any man here to follow my advice; but, so help me God, if I don't do it, you may call me Sheil of the silk gown." These



were to be the mountebank legislators of Ireland! And this very Mr. Sheil, in the course of a few weeks, was actually brought into Parliament by his majesty's ministers, that they might make use of his moderation and sagacity in remodelling the English constitution.

It was impossible for O'Connell to admit, if he valued his popularity, that the law was too strong for him: the vulgar, whose ignorance he abused, believed him to be impregnable in law, because on every occasion he said so. They could not imagine how any power should interfere actually to disperse a meeting held under his sanction, and he was compelled to maintain that the dispersion was illegal. At the meeting of St. Thomas's parish already mentioned, he said, "I have now thirty years experience in criminal law practice, and I pledge myself, that it is plain to the clearest demonstration, that the act of the magistrates which dispersed the committee, was utterly illegal, and that those who sent them for that purpose were guilty of a high misdemeanour. If I be asked, why I did not appeal to a jury on this point, my answer is, that the act does not allow an appeal to a jury. If the meeting does not disperse in fifteen minutes after being summoned so to do, the magistrate may immediately commit those present to Newgate for three months." Nothing could be more inconceivable than the absurdity of this, except the miserable delusion of the populace, or the collusive blindness of the knaves who still followed in his train, apparently forgetting, as readily as he did himself, the huge mass of unredeemed pledges which he had been allowing to accumulate for years.

He had declared openly, when he constituted himself into a corporation, that if a single meeting were dispersed, it would be followed immediately by five hundred actions. A meeting of his own had actually been dispersed: he declared that the illegality of that dispersion was clear to demonstration; but the value of this declaration he would not put to the test of an action. He is asked, why he does not appeal to a jury, and his answer is the nonsense of saying that he could not appeal to a jury, because the meeting must disperse in fifteen minutes. But, in the first place, if there was no room for an action, why had he pledged himself to the believing mob, that a single case of dispersion would be followed by hosts of actions, and begged their five-shilling contributions to enable him to fight these battles? And, secondly, the question was not, whether, during the interval of fifteen minutes, he could try before a jury the point of his meeting being bound to disperse when the fifteen minutes had expired, but whether the dispersion at the end of the interval was legal. The question put to him, was this—'how comes it, Mr. O'Connell, that, after obeying an order which you say is illegal, and which you pledged yourself to try at law whenever it should be enforced, you did not bring the question to issue before a proper tribunal! Why did you not bring the magistrate to account for having illegally dispersed your meeting?' And O'Connell's answer was this—'since he did disperse us illegally, that prevents me from shewing that he did so; but if he had let us alone, then I would have had him before, a jury for illegally dispersing us.'

But although Mr. O'Connell, while



he abused his followers with pledges "false as lovers' oaths," knew the law too well to have any wish to appear before a jury, the government determined that before a jury he should go. On the 18th of January, he, and his leading partisans, Lawless, Steele, Barret, Dwyer, Reynolds, Redmond, and Clooney, were apprehended on informations which charged them with having held various meetings (which were specified) in violation of the lord-lieutenant's proclamation issued under the authority of the statute, and with having conspired to violate and evade the said proclamation, and the mandates thereof. O'Connell, when carried before the magistrates, inquired, whether it was by orders from their superiors, or on their own responsibility, that they had dared to issue a warrant against him, a householder of Dublin, and a member of Parliament! The magistrates, who ought to have given no answer to any such question, told him that they had acted upon instructions. He then went into an argument (for he argued every where except in the right place) to convince them, that the warrant contained no offence for which he could legally be held to bail; but he was under the necessity of closing his argument by giving bail, himself in 1,000*l.* and two securities in 500*l.* each. His satellites found bail for 200*l.*, and two securities for 100*l.* each. The occurrence, intelligence of which immediately spread through Dublin, had collected a crowd in the streets. O'Connell forthwith made a speech to them. "Yesterday I was only half an agitator; henceforth I am a whole one. Day and night will I now strive to fling off despotism, to redeem my country, to repeal

the Union, and to establish on a permanent basis, the happiness and legislative independence of my native land. Many an honest man who was yesterday opposed to the present agitation, will be, before the close of this day, a determined, unflinching friend to Repeal." At a meeting next day, at which he delivered one of his usual vituperative orations, he actually proposed going over to hold his assemblies in Liverpool. He continued to speak, and to publish letters, pretending to laugh at the prosecution, and the absurdity of the charge, while the nonsense which he spoke and wrote, utterly disgraceful to him as a lawyer, showed clearly that he felt there was no ground on which the charge could be successfully met. The universal theme of his argument was, that he was called in question for having disobeyed a proclamation, while every tyro knew, and he quoted lord Coke to prove it, that the king could not create an offence by proclamation; "I therefore laugh to scorn the charge against me of disobeying a proclamation." O'Connell himself must either have been the most ignorant blunderer that ever disgraced the name even of tyro, or he must have been of all men the most pitifully dishonest. If he was not the former, he knew that the proclamations which he was charged with having disobeyed, were proclamations issued by authority of an act of Parliament, and not in the exercise of any imagined prerogative in the crown; and if he was not the latter, he would not, knowing this, have indulged in the endless nonsense with which he inundated the public day after day, till the approach of the serious combat compelled him to



drop the mask, and shrink into nothing in the presence of law and reason. The Freeman's Journal, in which one of these diatribes appeared, under the title of a letter to his constituents, was brought by the Attorney-general, before the King's Bench, as a contempt of court; it being an endeavour, when the charge, under which the parties had been held to bail, was about to be submitted to the legal tribunals, to poison the public mind, and the mind of any jury that might go into the box, by inducing them to believe, that the charge was ridiculous and groundless, that the prosecutors were actuated by the basest motives, and that the sole object of government in issuing the proclamations was to secure the punishment of the persons proceeded against, whether they were guilty of an offence against the law, or not. An attachment was granted against the proprietor of the paper. O'Connell would not come forward to declare himself the author.

On the 25th of January, indictments were ready to be laid before the grand jury. Mr. Justice Jebb in his charge to the grand jury, gave a very different version of the offence and of the statute, from that with which the agitator had knowingly been deluding his followers. "If the lord-lieutenant, by his proclamation, has prohibited the assembly of a number of persons, and has signified his intention to prohibit them under a proclamation by a name and denomination, and if persons should, notwithstanding that, and with the knowledge of the proclamation, assemble and meet together for the purposes prohibited—if they assemble as such assemblies and associations, so pro-

hibited by the lord-lieutenant's proclamation, they commit a breach of the law; they are subject to an indictment, and to be punished as persons guilty of a misdemeanour, with such term of punishment as the common law provides for those guilty of a misdemeanour. The offence of assembling in breach of the act, may be committed, although the persons guilty of it may not have been called upon by the magistrates or the civil power to disperse, or being called upon by the civil power to separate, may have dispersed within the time prescribed by law. The second breach of the law for which I am informed the officers of the crown are to send up bills of indictment to you is this, a conspiracy to commit a breach of this particular act of Parliament; which is in itself an unlawful act. The informations go to establish this fact, that persons assembled as a meeting or association, forbidden by proclamation, did, when called upon by the civil powers, or when they were under the apprehension that they would be so called upon, conspire so as to do the particular act which they were forbidden by the proclamation to do. If persons constituting an assembly prohibited by proclamation agree to meet under another denomination, but for the same purpose, that is 'a shift or device;' it is a meeting of the same men, of the same persons, and may be called an adjournment of the same meeting; and, being so, it is a breach of the act of parliament. But if it should appear to you that the assemblage or meeting was really given up—that the object for which such meeting was held was abandoned, and that the persons forming it had



agreed to disperse, and thereby obey the lord-lieutenant's proclamation, but that for other purposes really, and *bona fide* distinct, they assembled together, then that is not a breach of the act of parliament. But if you, by witnesses, be satisfied that the persons charged, or any of them, were at such meeting and assembly forbidden by the proclamation to meet together, though they did afterwards under a different name assemble, then it is your duty to find the bills on the counts charging them with so meeting as that particular association; and if you should be of opinion that they did, with a change of name, but with the same purposes, agree to assemble together, then the construction that we give to the act is, that the agreeing and assembling of the same body to meet, with a change of name, is only a 'shift and device;' and if these persons confederated together for that purpose, then that is a conspiracy."

The grand jury found true bills against all the parties; and O'Connell, instead of manfully meeting the charge, set to work to invent every possible expedient by which he might gain delay. To some of the counts he pleaded not guilty, while to others of them, in order to gain time, and throw the case out of the term, which would protract the period at which, if convicted, he would be called up for judgment, he put in a demurrer. The other defendants followed his example, except that Redmund pleaded not guilty to all of the counts, and Steele pleaded *nul tiel record* on the proclamation stated in some of the counts. The pleas were filed on the 19th of January. On the 1st of February the Court of King's Bench, on the applica-

tion of the Attorney-general, (for O'Connell and his friends never moved in advance) ordered the demurrer to be argued on the 7th. To argue the demurrer, however, was no part of O'Connell's plan; he knew it was untenable in law, and that a demurrer admitted the truth of the facts stated in the indictment, so that a decision disallowing the demurrer, would amount to a conviction. The argument, moreover, in the Court of King's Bench, would require very different materials from those which were reckoned worthy of all acceptance at the Corn Exchange, or the Parliamentary Intelligence-office. Accordingly, on the 5th of February, two days before the day appointed for arguing whether the indictment did or did not contain a legal charge, O'Connell applied to the court for permission to withdraw his demurrer, and plead not guilty to the whole indictment, that is, to confess that what he was alleged to have done was a violation of the law, but that he had not done it. So far he gained his object, but the court would not allow him to withdraw his demurrer as a matter of course, or to place himself in the same situation as if he had pleaded not guilty at first. The demurrer was allowed to be withdrawn, and the new plea was received, only on the condition of—"the traversers undertaking to accept notice, and go to trial in the sittings after term, and conditioning, in case of a verdict of guilty, to submit to a judgment *instanter*—not to move in arrest of judgment, nor for a new trial; the traversers, at the same time, being bound to appear personally."

The Attorney-general accordingly seemed determined to push



the cause immediately to trial, and on the 9th of February the Court of King's Bench fixed it for the 17th of the month. The whole country looked forward with great expectation to the result. All good and reasonable men hoped that the law would be found too powerful for the agitator, but there was a general apprehension that it would be difficult to obtain a conviction from an Irish jury, while a defeat of the government, now so deeply committed, would add new vigour to the turbulence which they were striving to put down. On the other hand, O'Connell seemed to be tied to the stake, bound, by every regard to character and popularity, to fight out the battle to the last, and maintain, in his own person, the illegality of those proceedings of the administration, which he had so often denounced to others as demonstrable violations of the law: it seemed impossible that he should now belie all his professions, acknowledge the emptiness and futility of all his blusterings, and sink into craven submission, without descending for ever from the bad eminence to which he had climbed. The new expedients, however, to which he had recourse, in order to delay the trial, were new proofs of his unwillingness to encounter a jury. The trial was fixed for the 17th. A special jury must be summoned six clear days before the trial, otherwise they cannot be fined for non-attendance. O'Connell set to work to render this impossible. He received notice to attend the striking of the jury on the 9th. He attended, but refused to proceed, objecting, that although he had received the notice at such a time of the preceding day as gave

him more than four and twenty hours notice, he was entitled to a "free day's" notice, and could not be called on to proceed, upon this notice, to strike the jury till the 10th. He was allowed to have it his own way; but, on the 10th, when he attended to see the panel of forty-eight special jurors reduced to twenty-four, by each party striking off twelve, he insisted that he ought to be allowed till next day, the 11th, to deliberate what names he should strike off. The sheriff yielded likewise to this application, and the consequence was, that the jury could not be summoned six free days before the 17th, and on that day, therefore, the trial could not proceed. Accordingly, on the 11th, the Attorney-general gave notice that he would next day move the court to fix a later day for the trial. O'Connell's solicitor then made a request that the trial should be delayed till the following term, to which the Attorney-general gave a peremptory refusal. The Attorney-general was now convinced that O'Connell would submit to anything rather than go before a jury, and told his counsel, on the morning of the 12th, before moving the delay of the trial, that as the disallowing the abandoned demurrers would have entitled the crown to judgment on the first fourteen counts to which they had been pleaded, in which case he would have entered a *noli prosequi* as to the others, which were in their nature only subsidiary; he was still willing to be satisfied with a conviction insuring to the crown the same extent of advantage of which it had been deprived by the court allowing the demurrers to be withdrawn, and the plea of not guilty



on these counts to be recorded. This proposal was immediately acceded to, and O'Connell and his co-defendants, on the 12th of February, withdrew their plea of not guilty, as they had formerly deserted their demurrers, and pleaded guilty to the first fourteen counts in the indictment.\* These were counts charging the actual holding of meetings in violation of the various proclamations; the other counts, to which they still pleaded not guilty, charged them with having conspired to hold meetings contrary to the proclamations. On these latter counts the Attorney-general entered a *noli prosequi*, stating that the plea of guilty to the others would answer all the purposes of the prosecution, and that he would reckon it both unnecessary and unjust, now that he was entitled to have judgment upon these, to follow out the remaining charges in the indictment.

By withdrawing his demurrer, O'Connell had admitted that the law was against him, and by pleading guilty he had confessed that the fact was against him. Nothing remained but judgment. Yet scarcely had his plea of guilty been entered, when he hastened to a public meeting in Dublin, where he denied that he had pleaded guilty to anything. "In last night's *Dublin Evening Post*," said he, "it is stated that I have pleaded guilty to fourteen counts of the indictment. A greater falsehood was never stated even in that paper. I would rather that the arm was cut off from this body

than plead guilty to one count. Though I have allowed judgment to go by default on fourteen counts, it is because I dispute the construction of the law by the Attorney-general, and that I have the liberty of carrying, through the twelve judges, to the House of Lords, the question of law, which I shall not discuss till then." He had demurred to the indictment for the very purpose of raising the law: why had he not gone on to try it, instead of withdrawing his demurrer? If judgment went against him on the demurrer, he could have taken the opinion of the superior courts just as well as by keeping back the matter of law to move it in arrest of judgment. Very possibly his object had been to gain time by demurring, and afterwards, in the event of conviction, urging the same matter of law in arrest of judgment—the only form in which, after conviction, he could get a judgment upon the law. But the court and the Attorney-general had foreseen and prevented this piece of trickery; and he had not been allowed to withdraw his demurrer, except on the express condition, not only that he should immediately go to trial, but that, in the event of a conviction, there should be no motion in arrest of judgment or for a new trial, to raise again the matter of law, which, if he meant to insist upon it, he ought to have argued under the demurrer already on record. Delay was his sole object, and one reason why he fought hard to gain time seems to have been, to prevent his being called up for judgment till the expiry of the act under which he was prosecuted, and which had been passed only for a limited period. He trusted that govern-

---

\* These facts were stated in a letter from the Attorney-general for Ireland, which Mr. Stanley read in the House of Commons.



ment might be disposed to lay hold of the expiry of the act as a reason for not calling him up for judgment at all, and the event shewed that his anticipations were not ill-founded. At the commencement of the proceedings against him, he told an aggregate meeting, assembled to petition for the repeal of the union, "The proclamation act expires next June. It shall never be renewed, I tell you that O'Gorman Mahon and I will alone be able to prevent its renewal. He and I will make it impossible to pass it, for we shall keep the House adjourned for twelve months together before it shall become a law. When it expires, we shall be able to form election clubs in every county; and no man shall go to Parliament who is not a decided friend to the repeal of the Union, or who shall not pay very dear for his seat."

The pitiful termination in the King's Bench of O'Connell's loud boastings, and the confession that his proceedings had been contrary to a law too strong for him to contend with, were so little expected from his reckless boldness, and seemed so fatal even to his mob-popularity, that a very general belief prevailed of his having been induced to plead guilty, in consequence of some private understanding with the government, which had thus purchased an apparent triumph by a compromise which would have betokened real weakness. In the House of Commons, on the 14th of February, the marquis of Chandos put the question to Mr. Stanley, the Secretary for Ireland, whether there was any truth in a statement in general circulation, that Mr. O'Connell had pleaded guilty on condition that the proceedings would,

by a sort of compromise with the Irish government, pass over? Mr. Stanley answered, that he had heard the rumour with pain, but it was unfounded. "I do not mean to say that Mr. O'Connell's friends have not exerted themselves to avert from him, if possible, the probable punishment of the law; but I do most explicitly declare, that, in doing so, they acted without the connivance or the knowledge of any member of the Irish government. Nay more, I declare, that the only answer given them by the authorities in Ireland was, that we can enter into no negotiation with Mr. O'Connell; that when we take into consideration the impression which that gentleman's conduct has produced on both sides of the Irish Channel, the Irish government feel it would be impossible for them, consistently with their own dignity as a government, to enter into any negotiation implying the remotest compromise with the traversers, or that might lead them to suppose that the government would abate one inch. This declaration I repeat here, and I have only to add, that, let Mr. O'Connell act as he thinks most expedient for himself—of that he is himself the best judge—it is the unalterable determination of the law-officers in Ireland to let the law take its course against him." A few days afterwards, Mr. Stanley reverted voluntarily to the same topic: he stated to the House more in detail, and on the authority of the Attorney-general for Ireland, the facts which have been already narrated as connected with the plea of guilty, and added, "I think the House will agree with me, that this statement completely bears me out in the assertion



which I made on a former evening, that the government had entered into no negotiation with Mr. O'Connell; that it had not made any compromise, or even the slightest shadow of any compromise with Mr. O'Connell; and that it had expressed *its unalterable determination to be, that, let Mr. O'Connell act as he pleased, judgment should be pressed against him.* The crown having thus obtained, without the slightest compromise, a conviction against Mr. O'Connell and his associates on the first fourteen counts of the indictment, did not think it right to proceed against them on the last sixteen counts, which charged them with a conspiracy. In adopting that course of procedure, the crown acted upon the lenient principle adopted by ordinary prosecutors at the ordinary assizes; and I am of opinion that if such lenity be advisable towards the culprits at ordinary assizes, it is still more advisable and expedient when exhibited towards a political opponent. Indeed, I am sure that if the crown had persevered in its original intention of going to the jury on the last sixteen counts of the indictment, it would have given to the transaction an appearance not of justice but of persecution. In pursuing the course which it has done, the crown has treated Mr. O'Connell as it would have treated any other individual—it has vindicated the outraged law; and by so doing, has inspired the discontented with awe, and the well-affected with confidence. It has procured a verdict against Mr. O'Connell, *and it will, undoubtedly, call him up to receive judgment upon it.*

These declarations were perfectly satisfactory to the House and to

the country; for they seemed to render any subsequent arrangement to prevent O'Connell from being brought up for judgment as impossible as they made it certain that none had been gone into to save the crown from the risk of encountering a jury. But to O'Connell himself they were not at all satisfactory, because the language used by Mr. Stanley on the 14th implied, that exertions had been made, on the part of the agitator, to negotiate a treaty with the government. When the proceedings were terminated, O'Connell proceeded to London to attend his duty in Parliament; and on the 28th, he put the question—whether any persons on his behalf had proffered a compromise?—to Mr. Stanley, in the House of Commons. He declared, at the same time, that he had authorized no person to offer a compromise, and that, so far as he knew, none had been offered. The answer to this mad question, and these unblushing assertions, brought out the fact, that he actually had attempted a compromise, being guilty of the additional meanness of dictating the letter to his son, instead of writing it himself. Mr. Stanley now stated farther, that he had been waited on by two personal friends of Mr. O'Connell, lord Glengall and Mr. Bennett, the latter being both a private and a professional friend; that they laid before him a certain letter, which letter had been dictated by Mr. O'Connell himself to his son, and was inclosed in one addressed by his son to Mr. Bennett; that the purport of the letter was to induce the Irish government to compromise, on certain terms, the prosecution against Mr. O'Connell; that the answer returned was, that



no such compromise could for a moment be entertained, that no negotiation could be entered into with any person on the part of Mr. O'Connell, and that the law must take its course. "For the truth of these facts," said Mr. Stanley, "I refer Mr. O'Connell to Mr. Bennett and the earl of Gengall, who have authorized me to make use of their names, and I hope that I have given this question a most explicit answer."

Mr. O'Connell admitted distinctly that the government had not compromised the prosecution, and he admitted distinctly, that every thing Mr. Stanley had stated was true, even to the fact of the terms of compromise having been dictated by O'Connell himself to his own son. Notwithstanding this, he set to work to explain away the facts, and kept the House in a roar of unextinguishable laughter, at the absence of all sense of shame, with which he denied having attempted a compromise, while every sentence he uttered contained the terms on which he wished to have obtained it. He even could not deny, that he offered to give up agitation for the repeal of the Union, if government would abandon the prosecution, and inform him what measures they intended to propose for the benefit of Ireland. Yet he denied having offered a compromise, and referred to his son's note to Mr. Bennett, accompanying the letter of compromise, every sentence of which note was compromise through and through. "What," said Mr. O'Connell, "does my son say? Why he writes—'My father has been so much deceived and deluded by the present Administration, that he will not enter into any negotiation with any of its members,

till it first consents to abandon the prosecution against him without any equivocation. [ *Laughter* ] And my son adds, that 'as it may not be exactly conformable with the dignity of the Irish government to formally abandon the prosecution, my father will not insist on a formal abandonment.' [ *Continued laughter* ] My son then specified the terms on which alone he would consent [ *a laugh* ] to a compromise—namely first, that the prosecution should be unequivocally withdrawn, and, secondly, that the Irish government should state what measures of relief were intended towards Ireland. While I admit, therefore, that the government did not compromise the prosecution, I deny that I entered into any compromise with the government." But Mr. O'Connell was not charged with having actually made a compromise; he was charged with having unsuccessfully attempted it. He was charged with having proposed terms which the government rejected. He had averred, that he had authorized no compromise to be proffered, and that none had been proffered with his knowledge; and he had now been compelled to acknowledge that every part of that denial was inconsistent with fact.

From the declarations of the Irish secretary, so pointed and so strong, the public had a right to expect that the prosecution would be brought to a termination in due course of law, by the convicted agitators being brought up to receive the judgment of the court. In this the public was disappointed, and O'Connell and his associates were allowed to escape, as if they had never been convicted. The reform bill was brought in; and Mr.



O'Connell, though it gave neither annual parliaments, nor universal suffrage, nor vote by ballot, and though he wished that it should give to Ireland six or eight members more than were intended to be conceded, became a staunch voter and speaker for the ministry. Opposition members hinted in the House that there seemed to be symptoms of an amicable approximation between him and his prosecutors. The Act for suppressing illegal and dangerous associations under which O'Connell and his co-agitators had been convicted, was allowed to expire; the ministry did not call for its renewal, and they made the fact of its expiring their justification for not proceeding to demand judgment against the convicted. The pledges which they had given admitted of no such subterfuge. They had declared, again and again, that it was their unalterable determination that the law should take its course—that judgment would be pressed against Mr. O'Connell—that they would “undoubtedly” call him up to receive judgment upon the conviction. When they made those declarations, they knew that they could or could not compel him to appear for judgment, before the expiring of the Act. If they knew that they could not, then, by those declarations they pledged themselves to press judgment against him, even though the Act should have expired. If on the other hand they could have compelled him so to appear, but did not exert their power, they were then guilty of creating a pretext to get rid of their pledges, and one which, even after it had been created, was too flimsy to serve any good purpose.

The disorders which prevailed in

the country, and the turbulent proceedings of O'Connell, had the good effect of drawing forth expressions of opinions of a contrary tendency, from the more respectable and influential portion of society. Among men of weight and education, the repeal of the Union had not as yet found many abettors. The agitators were anxious to represent it as being an Irish question, in which all distinctions between catholic and protestant ought to be forgotten; and one of their many falsehoods was, to declare that all intelligent protestants were on their side. The protestants knew too well what they would have to expect from a catholic parliament sitting in “College Green,” to be misled by the pretended love of liberty which formed the text of the tools of the popish priesthood. Even the catholic laity of the better classes kept aloof from the agitators; and Lord Cloncurry, who had been a main pillar to the cause of emancipation, drew down upon himself the wrath of O'Connell, because he would not play the same character in obtaining a repeal of the union. A loyal address, reprobating the proceedings of the demagogues, was presented to the Lord-lieutenant, signed by almost every respectable name of the Irish bar. A similar address was voted by the corporation of Dublin; and one still more important, as coming from independent men, of all parties except that of universal confusion, was presented by the bankers, merchants, and traders of Dublin, expressing their detestation of the spirit of lawless turbulence which had gone abroad, generated by popular delusions, and inflamed in the pursuit of impracticable schemes, and declaring



“their fixed determination to support, with their utmost means, the measures which, in the existing state of the country, might be necessary to re-establish order and protect property, to maintain the authority of the laws, and to preserve inviolate the integrity of the United Kingdom.” That men of education, property, and character, should dare to entertain such opinions was enough to draw down upon them the denunciations of the agitators, and it was in language like the following (which actually appeared in one of the insurgent newspapers in reference to the above address) that these liberal minded patriots argued a great political question:—“Some wretches, whose trade is adulation—whose creed, subserviency—whose god, their money—whose altar, the desk—whose temple, the counting-house—and whose country, self—have been going about for some days, kidnapping the unwary into a requisition for a meeting of the Chamber of Commerce, to adopt a congratulatory address to the marquis of Anglesey. Slaves, base, degraded slaves, beware of what you do! We know your names—we will keep close watch upon you—and now we forewarn you, protestant bankers, you recreant catholic barristers (not lawyers), and cotton-spinners, and pauper-dealers, that if you persevere in this course, we shall put a brand upon you, that when you walk along the streets, despised, abhorred, and shunned, the very dogs themselves shall bark and flee your contact.”

In parliament, too, the repeal of the union was denounced, even by government, as an occurrence which was not to be treated as a possibility—as a dismemberment

of the empire which Britain would resist, even at the expense of a civil war. On the 8th of February, a motion for copies of all proclamations issued by the Lord-lieutenant, was made by Mr. O’Gorman Mahon, who had succeeded O’Connell in the representation of the county of Clare. This gentleman was one of the mob orators of Ireland; he transferred to the House of Commons the slang and vulgar abuse with which he had been accustomed to amuse his mobs, and gave the speaker infinite trouble, till the nuisance was abated in consequence of the Chairman of a committee, named to try a petition against Mahon’s return, reporting that this patriotic and reforming agitator had obtained his seat by bribery, and the Speaker’s nod removed him from the House amid the loud laughter of its members. On the present occasion the object of his motion was, in the first place, to abuse ministers because they had enforced the law against O’Connell, and secondly, to assure them and the House, that it was in vain for them to oppose the repeal, because Ireland was determined to have it. “It was said, that England and Ireland must stand or fall together; but England had hitherto been standing with her foot on Ireland’s back: by this means she had raised herself in the estimation of the world; but when Ireland was removed from beneath her, she would find her level, and her iron heel would press the cold soil. Men of all classes and parties were now united in favour of a repeal of the union; the repeal of the union was not popular here; it was not popular with absentees, who drew their rents from Ireland, and spent them in England or Italy; it was not



popular with some bankers, who lived by their discounts, but it was popular with the millions, the mass of the population of Ireland. It was unpopular with all who wished to keep up the connexion of the two countries; but it was justly popular with all who were opposed to the continuance of that connexion. England might send her cohorts to Ireland, but that would not do. The time for deliberation was gone by, and the people were determined to carry the measure. He was sure that, until lately, an appeal to force, in order to get rid of the union, was the last thing which the people of Ireland dreamed of; but whether it would be so now, he would not venture to say. England would have enough to do abroad, without breaking her spears on the bodies of the Irish, who had not yet either forgotten or forgiven the days of ninety-eight. He himself—and he now avowed it—had been, for the last eleven years and a half, a member of a secret society for accomplishing the repeal: but they had now dissolved their secret meetings, and were determined to press it openly.” The following passage, however unspeakably ridiculous, was a good illustration of the mode in which the agitators worked on their ignorant rabble. “Ireland had no confidence in England. This country must now endeavour to effect a compromise through the instrumentality of one man, between a total repeal of the union, and the holding of sittings alternately in the capitals of the two countries. Did hon. members imagine that they could prevent the unfortunate men who were five feet under the snow from thinking that they could better their condition by a repeal of the union? [Great laughter.] It might be said

that England had not caused the snow, but the people had the snow on them, and they thought that their connexion with England had reduced them to the state in which they now were [*A laugh*]. Whether that was true or not, they believed it to be so, and would act on their belief.” And assuredly Mr. O’Connell, or Mr. Mahon would have been the last men in Ireland to have told them that they were acting on an ignorant and erroneous belief.

To these threatening rhodomontades, Lord Althorp replied, that, in regard to the proceedings against O’Connell, they had been not merely justifiable, but necessary. His occupation had been to excite the people of Ireland, and though at the conclusion of almost every sentence he exhorted them to peace, there could be no doubt, in the mind of any unprejudiced man, that all his harangues tended to insurrection and rebellion. Agitation, which had for its object the repeal of the union, could lead to nothing else. There could be no doubt, that with separate legislatures, it would be impossible that the two countries should continue long connected. “It is the duty of the Irish government to act with decision and firmness to prevent such a danger. They are bound to abstain from force where that is avoidable; but while they are bound to put down sedition and rebellion, they are also called upon to do every thing in their power to promote the prosperity of Ireland, and they are prepared to take that course. I sincerely hope that the object of those who are in favour of the repeal of the union will not succeed; and, knowing that they cannot succeed except by successful war,



I must say, that though no man is more averse from war, and particularly a civil war, than I am, yet I must confess, that to me even civil war would be preferable to the dismemberment and destruction of the empire." Lord Palmerston, too, said, that the conduct they had lately witnessed would lead one to doubt the expediency of catholic emancipation, if any thing could shake their conviction on that subject. They were now assembled but a few months after having passed the greatest act of concession ever granted by a legislature, and yet were told that they had trodden down those to whom they had made that concession with "an iron heel." The noble Lord, who filled the office of Viceroy, had acted in perfect accordance with the wishes of government, and not only would he be undeserving of his situation, but the government would merit the severest censure and condemnation, did they allow themselves to be imposed upon by the shallow artifices of the factious and rebellious plotters against the best interests of the empire. Ireland, he would confidently affirm, did not desire the repeal of the union. He spoke not of the wretched creatures who submitted to the guidance of a demagogue, but of the intelligence, the property, and the respectability of the country. All who had any thing to lose had sided with the friends of the undivided empire; but if, nevertheless, it was fated that Ireland should be deluged with blood, assuredly that blood would be visited on those who had malignantly and guiltily brought about such a catastrophe; while government, who had done their utmost to avert it in the eyes of God and their coun-

try, would stand absolved from responsibility. From the other side of the House, Sir R. Peel, and Sir C. Wetherell bestowed high praise on government for the manner in which they had met, and expressed their determination to continue to meet the agitators. The latter said, he could scarcely believe it possible that, within eighteen months after they had been called on to pass the relief bill, as the only preventive against civil war, they should now hear the very same threat thrown out in other quarters as the consequence of refusing to repeal the union. Sir Robert Peel said, he should for ever feel ashamed of himself, were he to be deterred by party spleen, or political animosity, from proffering on this occasion his cordial, stedfast, and sincere support to the existing ministers of England. He would not now look out jealously for any slips or trifling oversights which those ministers might have in other respects committed; for the artifices and unworthy evasions, by which their exertions to promote the tranquillity of the country had been met, rendered it obligatory on every man of loyalty and honour to make common cause with any government so circumstanced. It was his duty to support them in all extremities, even in that dreadful one to which the noble lord had so energetically alluded. There was manifestly no alternative before them but the maintenance of the union, and if in securing that, it would be justifiable to resort to force eventually, how much more justifiable was it to adopt every practicable expedient which might possibly prevent so deplorable a consummation? Nay, more, they would be deeply and awfully responsible, if they



moistened the plains of Ireland with blood, unless they could show that they had previously employed every available means by which a rational man might hope to avert what no one could think upon without horror. The compliment intended to be offered by the trades of Dublin to Mr. O'Connell might have been passed unquestioned and uninterrupted, had not that learned gentleman given special notice and clear warning that his object was so to combine physical force as to render it after a time overpowering and irresistible. They now heard, for the first time, of secret societies having been long in existence, entered into with a view to the repeal of the union; but the great object which the catholics sought to obtain, as he had always understood, was an equalization of rights, and not a repeal of the union. The fact was, that the late agitation of this subject was to be ascribed to the recent events in Paris and Brussels acting on the feelings of an excitable people; but he did not rely on force or the revival of religious warfare as a means for silencing such discussions. He rather trusted to the good sense of the catholics, who, he hoped, would be convinced, before long, that it would be utter madness to attempt to carry their projects into execution by force, or the subtler frauds of conspiracy and sedition. They might rest assured that England, so long as she desired to retain her post of honour amongst the nations of Europe, would never be persuaded to yield to such a demand, except in the very last extremity; and after Ireland had been reduced by perhaps twenty years of civil war, to a moral wilderness, she would be in a sorry condition to enjoy the advantages in the pre-

sent day so insidiously set forth. He was firmly convinced that more danger was to be apprehended there from the abuse of liberty than from that of power, and was quite willing to strengthen the hands of government still further, should they deem an application to the legislature for that purpose in any degree necessary.

In the mean time the misery and the crimes of the people were increasing. In the counties of Clare, Roscommon, Galway, and Tipperary, the law seemed no longer to exist. Murder, robbery, searching for arms, these things, too, done by bodies of men who could be met only by military force, were the ordinary occurrences of every day. The police, even though armed, was altogether insufficient to meet the mischief on the thousand points in which it shewed itself, and their duty in all instances was a dangerous one. On one occasion, while following a body, who confessedly were proceeding to attack a house, they were themselves attacked, and five of them shot dead. To the usual modes of Irish outrage was now added another. The peasantry, men and women, armed themselves with their agricultural implements, and declared war against pasture land. In open day-light they entered upon the fields and dug them up. In the county of Clare in particular, all decent persons, of all opinions, declared that the county was no longer tolerable as a place of residence. The serving of threatening notices, the levelling of walls, the driving off cattle, the beating of herdsmen, the compulsory removal of tenants, the levying of contributions in money, the robbery of dwelling houses, the reckless commission of murder, were driving the better classes of



inhabitants to desert their houses, and seek refuge in some other quarter. A committee of Roman Catholic priests, which had been formed at Ennis for the purpose of endeavouring to restore tranquillity, dissolved themselves in utter hopelessness of being able to effect their object, publishing their opinion, that no effort within the power of the well-disposed inhabitants could put an end to the continued system of outrage and plunder which was spread far and wide. Even Mr. Thomas Steele, the *fidus Achates* of O'Connell, posted up in Ennis the magnificent denunciation :

“ Unless you desist, I denounce you as traitors to the cause of the liberty of Ireland. I and the other friends of the people will advise you no more, since you follow the counsels of miscreant villains, and not the advice of O'Connell, your clergy, and the other friends of the country.

“ I leave you to the government, and the fire and the bayonets of the military.

“ Your blood be on your own souls.”

The lord-lieutenant now made a progress through the disturbed districts, in the vain hope that his halcyon presence would restore tranquillity. He was neither assaulted nor murdered ; but the mischief remained as it was. Mr. M. O'Connell afterwards stated in the House of Commons (April 13th) that his lordship's visit had, in some instances, done harm. More vigorous measures were adopted. On the 10th of May a proclamation was issued, applying the insurrection act to the county of Clare, and certain baronies in the counties of Galway,

Roscommon, and Tipperary, and a special commission was sent down to try the offenders in these districts. The commission sat at Limerick, Ennis, Galway, and Roscommon. A great number of miserable wretches, were convicted, but capital punishment was very rarely inflicted. The cases consisted of some very atrocious murders, robberies, searching for and carrying off arms, sending threatening notices, administering illegal oaths, and digging up ground. In a case of the latter kind tried at Limerick, it was proved that, while the banded miscreants prosecuted their labours, they cheered themselves by shouting for “ Clare and O'Connell.” After the commission had issued, and while it was sitting, domiciliary visits were paid even to the poor to compel them to give money for conducting, as the offenders pretended, the defence of the criminals who were to be tried. O'Connell attended some of the trials, but rendered himself more conspicuous by his speeches to the people. He urged them to deliver up their arms, but merely on the ground that they would thereby propitiate the law officers of the crown, and render milder the sentences of those who might be convicted. He seemed to think that they were only agitating indiscreetly, and he took care to exasperate and embitter them by telling them that many of the convicts would have been acquitted, if the evidence had been fairly considered, but that the juries were afraid to pronounce any other verdict than guilty.

The ferocity of character, which these scenes fostered, led to constant fatal rencontres between the populace and those bodies to whom the



maintenance of the public peace was intrusted; and on every occasion on which the former suffered, however atrocious might have been their conduct, and however indispensable the mode of resistance adopted by the police and yeomanry, the Irish demagogues, in and out of Parliament, let loose their hundred tongues of calumny and falsehood to increase exasperation by representing the populace as the innocent and unoffending victims of armed butchers who delighted to revel in the blood of Catholics. These were the constant representations of men whose lips uniformly declared their great object to be, to abolish all animosities arising from religious distinctions. On the 23rd of May, at the fair of Castle Pollard, in the county of Westmeath, the police had occasion to seize an offender. The mob attacked the police, the prisoner was rescued and carried off in triumph; renewed assaults were made; the chief constable was knocked to the ground; the police fired; and nine or ten persons were killed. At the Mullingar assizes, in the month of July following, bills of indictment for murder were presented to the grand jury against several of the police. The grand jury ignored all the bills for murder, but, in four cases, found bills for manslaughter. The prisoners were then put upon their trial, and were all acquitted. The prosecutions were conducted by the government, for which government was visited with the displeasure of Mr. O'Connell, who insisted (11th of July) that the prosecutions should have been left in the hands of the aggrieved parties. If ministers had adopted the latter course, he

would then have abused them for sitting by with folded hands, while armed protestants were murdering unoffending catholics.

On the 18th of June, certain cattle which had been impounded for the payment of tithe were to be sold at Newtownbarry, in the county of Wexford. On the day of the intended sale, which happened to be market day, the populace were called to act by the following placard:

"Inhabitants of the parish of St. Mary, Newtownbarry, there will be an end to church plunder: your pot, blanket, and pig, will not hereafter be sold by auction, to support in luxury, idleness, and ease, persons who endeavour to make it appear that it is essential to the peace and prosperity of the country, and your eternal salvation, while the most of you are starving.

"Attend to an auction of your neighbour's cattle, on Saturday next, the 18th instant, seized for tithe by the rev. Alexander M'Clintock."

The police were thus put on their guard, and a body of yeomanry was in readiness. The populace interfered with the sale, and the police with the populace. The yeomanry again had to act in support of the police. The consequence was, that twelve or thirteen of the populace were killed, by the fire of the yeomanry, and about twenty wounded. The coroner's jury, after sitting for nine days, returned no verdict, six Protestants who were upon it, and six Catholics, being, it was said, directly opposed to each other in opinion. The crown directed its officers to make an investigation, in consequence of which, bills of



indictment were presented, at the Wexford Assizes in July against certain of the yeomanry, including the captain who commanded them, and a sergeant. The prosecution was conducted by the crown in conjunction with the next of kin of the parties killed. The bills charged murder; the grand jury ignored them all, but expressed their readiness to entertain bills for manslaughter against the captain and sergeant. The counsel for the next of kin refused to cooperate with the crown in trying for the minor charge, but the crown counsel declared that the case must be gone through, whatever the next of kin might choose to do. Bills for manslaughter against the captain and serjeant were then sent up. The bill against the former was ignored; a true bill was found against the latter. He was put upon his trial, but the witnesses had disappeared. The trial was postponed to the following day, but then, too, not one of them was forthcoming, and the case was delayed till the next assizes.

As the year advanced, this frightful mixture of lawless violence on the one hand, and bloody repression on the other, lost little of its horrors. Payment of tithe had long been unpopular. During the discussion produced by the reform bill, the church, and more especially the church of Ireland, had been spoken of in terms, which rendered it impossible for a populace, otherwise perfectly disposed to such ideas, to regard her in any other light than that of an unrighteous and wicked oppressor. Payment of tithes was almost everywhere refused; the usual system of threats and murder was again set in motion; the clergymen dared not ask,

the willing occupier dared not pay. The law was powerless, and wherever the officers of the law interfered, open and bloody war was declared against them. On the 25th of November, a body of police having apprehended a band of armed ruffians in the county of Kilkenny, required the assistance, not of the yeomanry, but of a party of military, to prevent a rescue. Even the attendance of regular troops did not prevent an attack: the military were under the necessity of firing, and five persons were shot dead. In the same county, on a more bloody occasion, the fortune of war turned the other way. On the 14th of December, a chief constable, with a strong party of police, went out to protect a process server in the execution of his legal duty, in serving the usual process for refused tithe. There were neither yeomanry nor military. The population prepared for murder. The sides of the road and the adjacent fields were covered with people armed with bludgeons, scythes, pitchforks, and other deadly weapons. They ferociously demanded that the process-server should be delivered up to them. The police having refused, the crowd closed upon them in a narrow lane, overpowered them, and murdered twelve or thirteen of them, besides leaving several of the party dangerously wounded. Among the killed was the captain of the police. The accounts bore that his son about ten years old, who accompanied his father, riding on a pony, was inhumanly butchered. The pony which the child rode was stabbed to death! Five of the police, who showed some symptoms of life after being barbarously beaten with bludgeons, had, as they lay insensible on the



ground, their brains knocked out by a peasant's son, not more than twelve or fourteen years old, who was armed with a scythe. The country people, after satiating their vengeance on the bleeding

bodies of the murdered police, by kicking and stabbing them, retired to their homes and usual occupations with as much indifference as if they had just performed some meritorious deed.



## CHAP. XI.

FRANCE.—*State of Parties—Turbulence of the Students—Riots in Paris against the Clergy—Proceedings against the Bourbonists—Insecurity of the Ministry—Resignation of Ministers, and formation of a New Ministry—Policy of the New Ministry—Riot Act passed—New Electoral Law—Expenditure—Attempt to raise a loan by public subscription—Prorogation of the Chambers—Tumults in Paris—Quarrel between the Ministry and the Heroes of July—Tour of the King in the Provinces—Disorderly state of Paris—Dissolution of the Chambers—General Election—Riots in Paris—Expedition against Portugal—Opening of the Session of the New Chamber—Celebration of the Revolution—Exhibition of Austrian banners in the Chamber of Peers—Small Majority in favour of the Ministerial Candidate for the Presidency of the Chambers—Ministers Resign—They withdraw their Resignations on the Invasion of Belgium by Holland—Expedition to Belgium—Great Majority in favour of Ministers on the Address—Bill for altering the Institution of the Peerage—Creation of Peers to carry it through the Upper Chamber—Riots in Paris—Complaints against the Bourbonists—Act banishing from France all Relations of the Bourbon Family, or of Napoleon—Serious Disturbances at Lyons.*

IN France, Paris continued to be the scene of ever-renewed disturbances, under the vacillating ministry of M. Lafitte. Too feeble in itself to control either of the two great parties, the administration attempted the task of navigating between both. Unfortunately it was weakest precisely on that point in which strength and firmness were required to bring back the kingdom to an orderly political condition. The popular party, or the party of the movement, as they were called, headed by all the demagogues, and backed by all the violent journals, considered the revolution merely as the commencement of a progression which was to place them in a new condition both at home and abroad. They insisted, that unless

the system of domestic change were carried to much greater lengths, and power more abundantly lodged, in various respects, in the hands of the people, that people would be disappointed of every thing which it was entitled to have expected from the resolution of July. Their foreign policy was still more extravagant. In their opinion, as the government ought to foster every possible combination of more popular power at home, so it ought to take arms in the cause of every insurrectionary people abroad. Poland was to be protected; French armies were to be marched into Italy to support the rebels of Lombardy and Romagna; while Belgium, again, as it had thrown off the yoke of Holland, ought to be at once



united to France, and the frontier of the regenerated kingdom extended to its natural barrier, the Rhine. It was true, that these things could not be done without violating treaties, and plunging into a general war; but the treaties had been concluded under the government of the Bourbons; these Bourbons had been overthrown; and it was an insult to "the New France" created by the revolution of July, to keep it fettered by treaties formed by its old rulers. These men did not conceal their opinion, that the duty of France was to consider the treaties of 1814 and 1815, as injuries which France had suffered, and that the time had now come when a new career of conquest and of glory should be begun.

The affairs of Belgium more particularly furnished them with the materials of almost daily attack. A considerable party in that country leaned towards an union with France, and the ministers were blamed for not having immediately overrun it. The Belgian congress elected as their sovereign, the duke de Nemours, a son of the king of the French. The proffered crown was refused, and this was another article of grave impeachment against the ministry. The duke of Leuchtenberg, a son of Beauharnois, had been proposed as a candidate; but the French ministers had declared that, if he was elected, they would not acknowledge him. Now, as the loud lovers of war and liberty happened likewise to be devotees of Napoleon, this interference was a new sin of government. "When we are asked," said General Lafayette, "whether we would go to war in violation of treaties, I answer, Yes,

both for France and for Belgium; and the king's government ought to make the same reply. For I take upon me to say that these treaties have not been entered into between the chief of France and her enemies, but imposed upon France by her enemies, who, by force of foreign bayonets, placed one of their own society in the Tuilleries, to traffic with our independence, and convert it to their own profit. When called upon to explain in this chamber, and in the presence of ministers, my notions of the system of non-intervention, I said, that whenever the right of sovereignty was claimed by the people, every intervention in the affairs of that people should be considered as a declaration of war against France. As to the re-union of Belgium with France, I would not have stopped to inquire whether it might be displeasing to this or that power; all the inquiry I should have made would have been, whether it was the desire of the majority of the Belgian people to effect, and the will of the representatives of the French nation to accede to, the union; for it is not within the province of the government of either country to offer or accept it. I should not have been restrained by the fear of offending England, who acceded to the treaties of Luneville and Amiens, which secured the union of Belgium with France, under Napoleon, for whom it cannot be imagined she had more regard than she has for Louis Philippe." Another great apostle of the sect, M. Mauguin, exclaimed, "if Belgium should offer herself, I would say, even at the risk of war, accept her. It would be a deadly war I know, but it would be to the



honour and glory of France. And, besides, who would dare to attack us? Would it be Russia? She has Poland and Turkey to contend with. Would it be Austria? She knows that with 50,000 men we should give her occupation in Italy. Would it be England? With steam-boats we could carry arms and battalions into Ireland. I here speak upon the supposition of war; but I speak only to induce ministers to collect all their forces for the moment of danger. Nations have their treacherous sleep; this sleep is death; and death is foreign invasion and partition." This latter was another favourite theory of the men of the movement; that the continental powers were only waiting a favourable opportunity to attack the new order of things at Paris, and that France ought, without delay, to strike the first blow. These reproaches were urged the more bitterly, that the opposition, when they succeeded in driving M. Perrier, and those who thought like himself, from the cabinet, because they were inclined to adopt towards Europe the conduct which peace and honour dictated, had expected that M. Lafitte would at once proceed to act on their favourite doctrines. Ministers repeated day after day, that no power in Europe had the most distant idea of attacking France, and if any did, that France was so well prepared, as to be impregnable. The armaments in the north had been considerable, and France had demanded an explanation, declaring, that if a Russian soldier should pass the frontier, and enter Austria, Prussia, or any other part of Germany, France would consider it her duty to take counsel of her honour alone. She, no doubt, was

fettered by treaties which were prejudicial to her interest, but they were treaties by which all Europe was equally bound. To break those ties would be to draw down upon themselves the united forces of all the European powers; and if this was the condition on which war was demanded, it ought to be openly avowed, instead of pretending that what was clamoured for could be done, and yet peace be maintained. "What can we do for Poland?" asked the foreign minister. "We are separated from that unfortunate nation by a distance of 400 leagues. If even the interest of France should allow her to risk in its favour the chances of war, and to violate the principle of non-intervention, how could we reach that country with arms in our hands? Should we, then, attempt the conquest of Europe? They are the campaigns of Napoleon that are proposed to us. We say with grief that we can do nothing for Poland by force of arms. As to Belgium, she is not situated beyond the sphere of France. As soon as the grand revolution which separated France from the ancient dynasty was consummated, without consulting our force, of which we alone possessed the secret, we proclaimed the principle of non-intervention: we declared that if a single foreign soldier should set foot on the Belgian territory, the government would take up the cause of Belgium. On that day France saved Belgium from the foreign powers. We have now to save Belgium from herself, and for that what must we do? It has been said that Belgium should be re-united to France. Belgium offers herself; why have you refused her? I will say, first, that Belgium has not



offered herself; the national wish legally expressed has not been addressed to our government, and consequently we have not refused what has not been offered to us. I admit sincerely that, in my opinion, this reunion is desired by a great majority of the Belgians, and would tend to the repose of Europe and grandeur of France. But Europe does not partake of my conviction; time and experience will probably produce it. In the mean-while ancient prejudices subsist; the recollections of great empires pre-occupy the minds of kings and nations, and if, in their alarm, only one should fly to arms, the whole world would be once more threatened with falling again into a chaos. What were we able to say to Belgium? ‘You wish to elect a chief?—but in this important choice do not forget what you owe to France, who has protected you when you could not stand alone; do not deprive her of her repose, which might be compromised; do not call a prince whose name might serve for malevolence and intrigue.’ The objections are followed up, and we are told—‘You incessantly proclaim the principle of non-intervention, and yet what do you do? Is it not to intervene to impose upon the Dutch and the Belgians an armistice, threatening whichever should refuse it with all the wrath of Europe? Is it not to intervene to restrain Belgium in the choice of a sovereign?’ I do not seek to weaken these objections. They would have some force if they were addressed to us in the name of the Dutch, an ancient and independent people, who for ages have figured in the annals of history; but in the name of the Belgians I cannot comprehend them. Belgium has

never been an independent nation, but has ever formed a part of some empire. For the first time the Belgians now appeal to the world to become an independent people. France, attentive to this generous resolution, supported it in the conferences at London. France, by her useful intervention, has obtained the recognition of the independence of Belgium by Europe. But to this recognition Europe attaches the condition that the peace shall not be disturbed. Is this intervention? It is counsel; and when has counsel been interdicted? To intervene, is to constrain by violence and force. When a Prussian army entered Holland, to re-establish the family of the Stadtholder, Prussia intervened in the affairs of Holland. As to fettering Belgium in the choice of her monarch, France demands of Belgium a reciprocity of good will—that her territory may not become a focus of intrigues, disquieting our internal tranquillity—and we make this demand in return for what we have done for her.”

The majority of the existing Chamber of Deputies did not concur in the sentiments of Lafayette and his party, and did not allow the government to be forced to adopt them; but they knew, nevertheless, that it was more inclined towards them than to more peaceable doctrines, and that, whether from identity of opinion, or from a love of popularity, it did not set itself with firmness to repress the tumultuary influence to which it was perpetually exposed. Thus it was only tolerated by the one party, while by the other, who complained of having been deserted, it was cordially disliked. The opposition,



though not the most numerous in the Chamber, was by far the most active and significant out of doors. Its schemes of popular rights, foreign interference, and military conquest, flattered the populace, and the students of the schools, who, since the days of the preceding July, had considered themselves as constituting France, and as being the only guides to liberty and glory. On the slightest occasion, or on no occasion at all, Paris was made the scene of tumultuary movements, which, though not serious in their direct and immediate consequences, betrayed the weakness of the government, and threatened, by their continuance, to destroy, in the minds of the populace, the idea of any repressing power whatever. The minister of public instruction, looking back to the conduct of the students in the latter part of the preceding year, issued a sort of proclamation, putting them in mind that it was illegal for them to form among themselves any associations, and to act or write in a collective capacity. A number of young men published an answer, setting the minister at defiance, and calling upon their fellow-students to join them in forming associations prohibited by the law. They were cited before the academic council, to whose jurisdiction, by the existing ordinances, they were subject. They refused to answer; they put forth a protest against the jurisdiction of what they called a "prevotal court," declaring that "they knew not the pretended tribunal which assumed the name of the royal council of public instruction, and which had referred the matter to another pretended tribunal, calling itself the academic council." The

meaning of this was, that the minister of public instruction, and the academic jurisdiction, with their powers and privileges, were not creations of the revolution of July. The friends of these young agitators surrounded the Sorbonne, where the court was sitting; they forced themselves into its presence, and raised a tumult. The minister of public instruction, and the attorney-general attempted to pacify them, but were answered with mud and stones, and made their way, the proceedings being suspended, as secretly as possible from the violence with which they had been assailed.

The public excitement was kept alive, at the same time, by constant rumours of conspiracies hatched by the adherents of the exiled family, or, as they were termed, Carlists. They were said to be spreading ramifications of their plots through the provinces of the west and the south, manufacturing and wearing white cockades, and even venturing to display the Bourbon banner. At Bordeaux this belief led to various arrests, but in the capital it terminated in much more serious scenes. On the 15th of February, the anniversary of the assassination of the Duke de Berri, some of the friends of the exiled family resolved to celebrate a religious service in the church of St. Germain l'Auxerrois. The police were aware of what was intended to be done; they expressed no dissatisfaction; they took no measures to prevent it. A funeral catafalque was placed in the church, as part of the proper apparatus of the ceremony, and when the ceremony had been quietly completed, without attracting any crowd, or exciting the slightest disturbance,



some person affixed to the catafalque a lithographic print of the young Duke of Bordeaux, the exiled son of the prince whose death had been commemorated, and some other individual placed above the print a chaplet of flowers. This trifling occurrence was sufficient to render Paris the scene of unrestrained riot. The report spread that the Carlists had been openly crowning a Bourbon, and that the priests, accomplices in the plot, had allowed a religious service to be prostituted to the purposes of a political conspiracy. A riotous mob stormed the empty church, and vented their wrath on its antique magnificence. The whole of the interior was destroyed; the ornaments of the altars, the Gothic decorations of the building, even the fixtures of the place, were broken down or torn up, till the temple was only the enclosure of a mass of rubbish. Even the exterior did not escape; Carlism and religion were denounced together; the fleur-de-lys was the emblem of the one, and the cross was the symbol of the other, and were removed or defaced in every part of the building by the increasing and furious rabble, who persevered in the work of demolition, regardless of the injury that might attend the coarseness of their operations. From the church they repaired to the palace of the Archbishop, although it was subsequently stated in the Chamber of Deputies, by the minister of public instruction, that the Archbishop had disapproved of the ceremony, and, along with that minister, had successfully applied to the curate of St. Roch, where it was originally intended to take place, not to allow it to be performed. The palace was sacked; the ecclesiastical re-

cords, the costly furniture, the magnificent library, were carried off as plunder, or wantonly destroyed, and cast into the Seine. The mob then marched to the church of the Assumption, and the church of St. Roch, to break down the crosses adorned with fleurs-de-lys which surmounted those edifices. Their attempts were only partially successful, from the want of the necessary implements; but the ministry itself now adopted their spirit, and executed their plans. By order of the government, workmen were immediately employed to remove from the churches, and other public buildings, the obnoxious, political, and religious emblems, perhaps, a very effectual mode of soothing the mob, but a melancholy display of subserviency to mob power. The greater part of the wholesale devastation which already had taken place, had been allowed to go on under the eyes of the national guards, and apparently with the open connivance of the authorities, all arising from one lamentable weakness, the dread of losing the favour of the populace. Even in the courts of law a veil was hung over the pictures and images of the Founder of Christianity, which were placed above the judgment seat. The government anticipated the populace, and removed, in all haste, the reliefs commemorating the campaign of the Duke d'Angoulême in Spain, which adorned the triumphal arch of the Place de Carousel. As it was a campaign which did not lead to glory, they ought never to have been there; but the vanity of the government which placed them was infinitely less dangerous to good order than the weakness of the government which, at the



command of a lawless mob, had removed them. The language, too, of the proclamations, which the authorities, according to custom, addressed to the rioters, was that of sympathy, or, at least, of impotence afraid to offend, and anxious to invent excuses for the outrages which it could not punish, rather than the voice of regular power asserting the omnipotence of law and of order. The minister of the interior told them, "a feeling of indignation, for which there is unhappily too much cause, has produced melancholy disorders. Forgetting the justice of the king, some citizens took upon themselves to execute justice. The principal authors of the factious ceremony, which took place yesterday at St. Germain l'Auxerrois, are in the hands of justice. It is the duty of us all to await in silence the sentence which they will soon receive. At present, no new disorder can find any excuse. Respect the public monuments! These words addressed to a civilized nation will not be uttered in vain. The Parisian people, offended by demonstrations hostile to a citizen king, and the revolution of July, will never belie their noble sentiments, so often tried." These were the harshest words that the government of France dared to address to "the civilized nation," the "Parisian people," the men "of noble sentiments," who had thrown the capital into confusion, with riot and pillage, and were assured by their governors, that, in doing so, they had only "executed justice."

The ministry lent themselves to keep up the delusion that the trivial incident, which had been made the pretext of these disorders, was the out-breaking of a deep, dangerous, and wide-spread Bourbon

conspiracy, the root of which was to be found in Holyrood. They ordered arrests, and domiciliary visits, for the purpose of seizing papers with all the industry and recklessness of alarm; and their journals put forth lying accounts of all manner of pretended discoveries. The government did every thing necessary to create a belief in this terrific plot, except producing evidence of its existence. Nor were their exertions confined to the capital. At Bordeaux, Nantes, Lyons, Dieppe, and other places in the provinces, arrests were directed, and the removal of crosses and fleurs-de lys enjoined, even where no symptom of popular commotion had appeared. Another consequence was, that a bill was brought in for the perpetual exile of the ex-royal family, which was carried, in the Chamber of Deputies, by a majority of 332 to 122, the minority including various members of the extreme left. In the other Chamber the opposition was more violent and animated, and the minority greater. It passed the peers by a majority of 29. In the course of the discussion, it was openly maintained by the opponents of the bill, that it was a law which the Chambers had no power to pass; that it could derive validity only from an appeal to the people; and some of them hinted, not obscurely, what Chateaubriand maintained at great length from the press, that if the people had been appealed to, instead of its rights being usurped by an existing legislature, called together by an authority which itself had destroyed, the Bourbons would never have been dethroned, and Louis Philippe would never have been crowned.

In the Chamber of Deputies



these occurrences exposed the ministers to blame from all sides. They were blamed for having permitted, since they acknowledged that they knew of it before hand, a ceremony which was likely to produce public disturbance, and they answered that they had no reason to expect anything more than a religious service. As the minister of public instruction, however, allowed that the Archbishop of Paris had dreaded evil consequences, and had attempted to prevent the ceremony, they were asked why, with such warning, they had not been prepared, either to forbid it, or to meet its consequences. From one quarter they were blamed, and with far greater justice, for ordering the removal of all crosses, because one act in a church had given offence, and following tamely in the train of the populace, armed and unarmed, which was not the place of a government; from another they were accused of allowing to escape with impunity insults which had been offered to the national guards, the only true estates of the kingdom. Here they were denounced as having violated personal liberty by their imprisonments and searches; there they were condemned for having delayed them too long, and at last dismissed many of the suspected, as soon as they were seized. The party of *the resistance* complained that the spirit in which ministers were acting would prevent for ever the formation of a strong, a firm, and a tranquil government; the men of *the movement* made the same complaint, but in a different sense, and for a very different reason, because ministers had not yet given to the country the government promised in July, viz., “a popular throne, surrounded by republican institu-

tions,” and Lafayette favoured the Chamber with his definition of republican institutions, describing them to consist in this, “a national guard, formed of all the armed citizens, and appointing their own officers.” It appeared, moreover, that ministers were not in harmony among themselves. The Chamber learned from the mutual recriminations of the minister of the interior, and the prefect of the Seine, that, during the disturbances, while the former was issuing proclamations, and attending to what he called the preservation of order, the latter remained in a state of inaction, and afterwards complained that his advice and his aid had never been asked. The minister, again, was angry at the prefect, whose duty he maintained it was, to present himself for instructions, but who had never offered himself for any share of the work. M. Baude, too, the prefect of the police, declared that, in his opinion, all these disturbances arose from the fact of nothing having been done, during the last six months, to satisfy the wants of the people, either political or physical. The people were without work, and therefore constantly at the mercy of agitators, and they had not yet obtained either a new electoral law, or a new municipal law. The existing legislature was not so constituted as to meet the wishes of the country.

The prefect of the Seine and the prefect of the police were immediately dismissed, but it was impossible that so ricketty a government could stand. M. Lafitte complained that the state of the Chamber itself had been injurious to the government; it was so divided on all questions of importance, that ministers were never



able to see clearly what was the majority. If he could find out where it was, he would obey it; and as the declaration of the prefect of police, that the existing legislature was not such as the country required, seemed to have been received with great approbation, he would take the orders of the king regarding a dissolution and a new election. This announcement seemed to give satisfaction to both sides of the Chamber. The majority, who by no means belonged to the party of the *mouvement* demagogues, seemed to feel that the weight of its numbers was neutralized by the want of moral influence in the capital, where it was the object of daily attack, as being both illegal in its origin, and hostile in its proceedings, to the power of the people. It was incessantly maintained in journals and clubs, and preached by mobs in the streets, that, having been elected under Charles X, the existing Chamber, since the revolution, was as unconstitutional as any thing which had then been destroyed; and, although it had acted from necessity for the immediate settlement of a government, it had no right to sit, after the immediate necessity had ceased. The demagogues, again, taking the prevailing tone of Paris, and the spirit which actuated its constant mobs, for that which would prevail all over the kingdom, flattered themselves with obtaining, at a general election, an increase of strength which would overpower all resistance.

Before a dissolution, however, could take place, it was necessary that, at least, a temporary new electoral law should be enacted. It was to the infinitely greater

extension of the right of suffrage which this law, to be framed under such a state of public feeling, might be expected to bestow, that the popular party trusted for success; while, on the other hand, the majority of the Chamber were determined that the extension should be the smallest which circumstances could justify. The bill had been introduced and referred to a committee, before the disturbances of February, and the discussions which followed them, but the ministry did not live to carry it through. On the 13th of March, M. Lafitte and most of his colleagues resigned, and M. Casimir Perrier was authorized to form a new ministry. M. Perrier himself took the office of minister of the interior, along with that of president of the council, in place of M. Lafitte and count Montalivet, the latter remaining as minister of public instruction, in place of M. Barthe. Baron Louis took the port-feuille which had been held by M. Lafitte, as minister of finance. Admiral Rigny was appointed to the admiralty, in the room of count d'Argout, and the count became minister of commerce. Sebastiani and Soult retained their places at the head of the foreign and war departments. All the new ministers were men decidedly opposed to yielding any thing to mob-government, or popular tumult; and the two members of the former ministry who remained, were not disposed to provoke, on slight grounds, war abroad. The premier was a person of much stronger and firmer mind than Lafitte, and was not likely, from his temper, to truckle, at least willingly, to congregations in the streets of Paris.

On his first appearance, in the Chamber as premier, M. Perrier



declared the principles on which he was determined to govern to be, to put down all irregular power at home, and refrain from any armed interference abroad. "The revolution of July," he said, "was founded on a principle, not of insurrection, but of legitimate resistance to the oppression of power; it had only changed the political system, but had not destroyed social order; it had founded a government, not inaugurated anarchy. In the interior, our duty is plain and simple; we have no great experiments to try, the nature of our institutions has been fixed by the charter of 1830. Several great legislative questions have been decided by you in the present session; the Chamber that will succeed you, will have to determine others. Until the new Chamber shall assemble, what will France require from her government? Activity: that order be maintained, that the laws be executed, and that authority be respected. Order is the chief of all our wants. We entreat all well-disposed citizens not to abandon the government, for the government will not abandon them. The maintenance of tranquillity is the maintenance of liberty. Our ambition is to re-establish public confidence, and we adjure all good citizens to co-operate with us for that purpose. The government repeats, that, far from abandoning them, it will be always ready to place itself at their head. Above all, let them trust in our firm resolution not to suffer any attack upon the public tranquillity, any encroachment upon the authority of the law. We must prevent those excesses which seem to accuse the insufficiency of the law, and the feebleness of power. All sedition is a crime, under

whatever flag it is arrayed; every act of violence is the beginning of anarchy. We shall propose to you laws to repress sedition and violence. These guilty disturbances, if renewed with impunity, would one day make enemies to the government of all those whom they disturb, in the liberty of their industry, in the liberty of worship, which we are bound to protect, as the most precious right which conscience invokes. In regard to foreign affairs, the principle of non-intervention has been laid down by the ministers who preceded us, and we have adopted it. We maintain that no foreign power has the right to interfere by force of arms in the internal affairs of other nations; but is this, at the same time to declare, that we will interpose with our arms for this or that form of government, wherever this principle is not respected? This would be an interference, though of a different nature; it would be falling into the system of the Holy Alliance; it would be to raise the chimerical ambition of those who would submit Europe to the yoke of one single idea—that of realizing a universal monarchy. This interpretation of the principle of non-intervention would serve as a cloak to the spirit of conquest. We will sustain the principle by negotiations; but the interest or the dignity of France ought alone to call upon us to take arms. We do not concede to any people the right to force us to combat in their cause, and the blood of Frenchmen belongs alone to France. The cabinets which have preceded us have repelled any armed intervention in Belgium. This policy shall be ours; this example we adopt. In similar questions do not doubt that France will always



hold the language which becomes her name. Never shall we forbid a lively sympathy for the progress of European societies ; but their destiny is in their own hands, and liberty ought always to be national. Every foreign provocation impairs and compromises it. On the part of private individuals, it is a bad service to render to people ; on the part of Governments, it is a crime. France does not exhort the world to liberty, but by the pacific example of the regular developement of her institutions, and by her respect for the rights of all other states."

To the liberals these principles, which left them little to expect in the way of their vocation, were still less satisfactory than the vacillation of the former ministry on whose fears they could always operate ; and the discontented journals which sent forth their angry strains of condemnation were almost as loud and as numerous as if they had been denouncing the government of prince Polignac. The new ministry was designated as something little better than the return of the old government—a combination against the spirit and blessings of the revolution, ready to sacrifice Poland, Belgium, and Italy to foreign aggression. Sebastiani, the foreign minister, found himself somewhat embarrassed by declarations which had been made under the yielding ministry of M. Lafitte. He admitted, in answer to a question from Lafayette, that he had written, but whether to the Austrian government, or to the Italian insurgents, did not appear, that France "would never consent" that Austrian troops should enter Italy to repress the popular revolts ; but he now explained, that

"not to consent," was something very different from making war to prevent ; while the opposition maintained, that to France and to the world, not to consent, meant not to permit. As it was assumed that the government could no longer be trusted with the safety and glory of the country, an association was formed for the patriotic purpose of resisting, without the aid of government, the Bourbons and the foreigners who were represented to be ready to take arms in their behalf. The members of the association were to pay twopence a-month to ensure the independence of France, and the perpetual exclusion of the fallen dynasty, and pledged their lives and honour to the same glorious cause. The offices of the opposition journals became its subscription rooms, and all who were their readers became its members. Among them were numbered many who had figured in politics, and held office. Though immediately directed against the new ministry, its successful development would have made it too powerful for any government ; but ministers, though convinced that it would be difficult to conduct the public business, or long to maintain either internal tranquillity or external peace, in the face of such a league, extending its branches all over France, would not venture on any measure for its suppression. M. Perrier, however, had recourse to every means of indirect discouragement. Every man who joined it, and held any situation under government was immediately dismissed, without regard to rank or station. M. Laborde, the private friend of the king, having refused to withdraw his name, ceased to be his majesty's aide-de-camp, and a counsellor of



state. Odillon Barrot, who still retained the office of a counsellor of state, was deprived, for the same reason, of this last fragment of office. General Lamarque, the most extravagant of incendiaries in the tribune, and commander of the forces in the departments of the west, put his name upon its lists : that command was suppressed in order to get rid of him. A number of lawyers, holding judicial situations in Paris and the provinces, were deprived, on the same ground, of their official appointments. They were thus influential men and influential classes that the league was to comprehend ; but the unflinching vigour with which M. Perrier set himself against all who joined it, the growing strength of the government itself, and the speedily detected delusion of supposed danger from foreign invasion, threw the whole scheme into a rapid and mortal decline.

One of the first measures of the new ministry was the introduction of a bill for the prevention of those crowds and commotions which kept Paris unceasingly in a state of feverish excitement. It enacted that all those persons forming part of any assemblage in public places, though not indulging in any act of outrage or violence, should be bound to disperse, on being required so to do (*Sommation*) by the mayor or prefect of police, and if the summons was repeated thrice in vain, force was to be used, and the persons whose obstinacy rendered it necessary, were to be liable to such punishments as would be inflicted by the tribunal of simple police. If, again, the assemblage had gone the length of disturbing the public tranquillity, the punishment was to be imprisonment, not

exceeding three months, except in the case of arms having been carried, whether concealed or not ; when the imprisonment might be extended to two years. If the individuals convicted happened to be persons who were not domiciled in the vicinity of the scene of the disturbance, they were further to be ordained not to come within ten myriometers of that spot for a year, under the penalty of being imprisoned during the period by which they had shortened the year of interdiction. The bill, as it threatened to deprive the opposition of that imposing display of public opinion which consists in the riots and terrors of a tumultuous mob, was, of course, resisted manfully by them, and by their press ; but the ministry urged it on, and it speedily became law.

In the middle of April, new tumults arose which it seemed difficult to ascribe to any more definite cause, than the habit which the Parisian populace had acquired of thinking themselves entitled to do whatever they deemed proper. From the 14th to the 17th of that month, crowds of idle and mischievous men assembled, day after day, at different points, and stalked about the streets, armed with stakes and bags of stones, uttering all manner of republican and seditious cries, breaking windows, pulling down lamps, disarming isolated military posts, insulting individuals of the national guard, robbing the capital under the very eyes of the government, of all security and all tranquillity. The growing mischief was allowed to go on, for two or three days, unheeded ; but, at last, orders were given to enforce the law which had just been enacted, and military of the line, both infantry and cavalry,



as well as the national guards, were employed to execute it. Commissioners of police were sent forth, backed by the troops, to read the new riot act, with sound of trumpet. The mobs, instead of obeying the summons, answered it with shouts of insult, and showers of stones, insisting on their right to remain in the streets and public squares. The cavalry immediately charged, and a single exertion of vigour scattered in an instant these vagabond assemblages, which owed their power to nothing so much as the servility with which they had been coaxed and flattered, instead of being punished.

Before the ministry of M. Lafitte resigned, their new electoral law had been fully brought before the Chamber. The bill presented by the government increased the number of persons who should be qualified to vote, but did not fix any particular amount, either of property or taxation, as a necessary qualification. As the law stood, the qualification consisted in the payment of 300 francs (12*l.*) in taxes. That rate yielded about 94,000 electors for the whole kingdom. The project of ministers was to double the existing number of votes in each electoral college, and to take the whole number from those who paid the greatest amount of taxation, beginning at the highest in the scale, and gradually descending, till the fixed number should be completed. There would thus have been about 188,000 electors. The committee, however, to which according to the practice of the French Chamber, the bill was referred, rejected this mode of arranging the franchise, on the ground that the electors whom it would create would be in a very imperfect proportion to the

wealth and population of the kingdom, would render the electoral capacity extremely variable, might be rendered subservient to ministerial frauds, and because it was repugnant to the decided and unanimous opinion of the public. They resolved, therefore, to adopt taxation as the rule, that is, to retain the rule which already existed, but to reduce the amount necessary to confer a qualification. The present amount was 300 francs. They assumed that experience had shown that this qualification had not introduced any improper class of electors, even when the rights and powers of a representative constitution were new to the country; it was therefore to be inferred, that, after sixteen years constitutional education, the sign of electoral fitness might safely be set at a point lower by at least one-third. Independently of such considerations, the sign, while apparently remaining fixed, had actually been rising, in consequence of other changes. The various reductions which had favoured property since 1814, had produced this effect, that the independence of fortune formerly indicated by paying 300 francs, was now indicated by paying 240 or 250, so that the number of electors had been diminished. Besides as the spirit of the French law was, unceasingly to divide property, it was uniformly increasing the number of those who paid the imposts on property, and just as uniformly reducing the number of large quotas. The committee, therefore, had at first resolved to propose that the qualification should be fixed at 200 francs of taxation; but the majority had come afterwards to be of opinion that it might be dangerous to make at once so great a change, of which it



was difficult to foresee the results; that it would be wiser and safer to act progressively, and enlarge the political qualification, if necessary, by degrees. The members, too, who formed this majority regarded with apprehension the number of electors that the reduction of the qualification to 200 franks might produce: not, they said, that they were doubtful of the nation, which had given too many proofs of wisdom, moderation, and attachment to order, to excite any fears on that account; but they dreaded the confusion which might result from it, as well as the change that the real character of the election might receive. They were apprehensive of the action of parties, which must always be deeply felt upon masses, when it exercises an influence on a more limited and intelligent number. The committee, therefore, proposed, that the electoral qualification should be fixed at 240 franks (about 9*l.* 10*s.*) in taxes, with this addition, that in all the electoral *arondissemens* where the number of electors possessing this qualification should not be in the proportion of one out of 200 inhabitants, those most heavily taxed beneath the qualifying amount should be included to make up the proportionate number. The latter combination would yield at first 162,000 electors; and as in seventeen departments the number of electors paying 240 francs would exceed one out of 200 inhabitants, this difference would afford upwards of 29,000 electors more. Thus the system presented by the majority of the committee would afford a total of about one hundred and ninety-one thousand electors more than double the existing number, deriving their qualification from

the payment of a certain amount of taxes: the number of them at Paris would be 19,000. As the law stood, there were departmental colleges, which elected a certain number of the members, without the intervention of the colleges of the *arondissement*. In the former, the electors consisted of the fourth part of the electors in the latter, who paid the highest amount of taxes. They thus enjoyed a double vote, and the intention of the arrangement had been, to give a preponderance, or at least a countervailing power, to the wealthier classes. The double vote, and the departmental colleges, were now abolished. Under the existing law no elector could vote till he was thirty years old; the age required was now reduced to twenty-five. Members of the institute, and retired officers of the army and navy, enjoying half-pay to the amount of about 50*l.* a-year, were to be allowed to vote on a qualification of 100 francs, or 4*l.* The qualification for being elected was to be 500 francs, 20*l.*

So far from these alterations wearing the character of extravagant sacrifices to popular clamour, a reasonable man is inclined to be surprised, when he looks at the far more radical changes which the ministers of Britain were, about the same time, effecting in her constitution, that no more dangerous experiment should have been made, where society was still disturbed by the slowly subsiding tempest of actual insurrection which had overturned a throne. They were far, however, from satisfying the demands of the *mouvement* party—who had not the cunning of our own radicals to be prudently silent as to what they wanted, in order to make sure of



what was offered. They succeeded in bringing back the franchise to the rate which the committee itself had originally adopted, viz. 200 francs of taxes, instead of 240, and that the next highest payers below that point should be included, not when the number of electors was smaller than one in 200 inhabitants, but when it was smaller than one in 150. This reduction, it was anticipated, would raise the number of electors considerably above 200,000 in a population of more than 30,000,000.

The elections being thus provided for, nothing remained to prevent the dissolution but the necessity of making financial arrangements for the public service in the interim. M. Lafitte had opened his budget, but the supplies of the year had not been voted, when he resigned. The extraordinary services alone of the year amounted to nearly 220,000,000 of francs, or nearly 8,000,000*l.*, and he had proposed to raise 200,000,000 by sales of the national forests. M. Perrier wished to raise a loan of 120,000,000, nearly 5,000,000*l.*, in rentes at five per cent, and an ordinance was issued to that effect. But he was afraid to negotiate it on the unfavourable conditions which the depression of the funds would have imposed upon the government, and some speculator who had, perhaps, heard of the English loyalty loan, suggested the easy expedient of getting a sufficient number of patriotic Frenchmen to subscribe the required loan, at five per cent at par, in such sums as they might choose; in other words, that individual subscribers should advance to government nearly 5,000,000*l.* for the same nominal amount of five per cent stock, the

five per cents varying, at that time, between seventy seven and eighty. The plan struck the public fancy; a few great names, such as Marshal Jourdan, setting the example. They were followed by about seventy deputies, by rich capitalists, by wealthy peers, by bankers, generals, advocates, artists, doctors, and professional people of all kinds, journalists, and shopkeepers. Motives of vanity, ambition, or patriotism, combined to the success of the scheme. It was brilliant, sentimental, and theatrical. On some it conferred the merit of making a sacrifice for the good of their country; for others it procured the reputation of patriots at a cheap rate; and to others it supplied an opportunity of at once showing their wealth and their liberality—of being talked of in the saloons, and celebrated in the journals. The society of brokers and exchange agents joined their exertions to those of individuals. The journals were filled with lists of subscribers having the amount of their advances placed opposite their names. Subscriptions to the loan became the fashion of the moment, and supplanted subscriptions to the patriotic society. All classes would have their names on the “Great Book;” and a pecuniary sacrifice of twenty per cent, which the operation required, added more than twenty per cent to the fame of their anterior patriotism. But, just because it took the Parisian fancy, as being something new, sentimental, and theatrical, it was only the fashion of a day. By the time the stock of patriotism had been exhausted, only about 240,000*l.* had been subscribed, barely one-twentieth of the sum which the minister required,



and he was thrown back upon his own resources, and compelled to negotiate the loan in the usual way.

The necessary votes having been passed, the king, on the 20th of April, closed, by a prorogation, this first session of his first Parliament, which had taken a crown from the head of an ancient dynasty, to place it upon his own. His majesty addressed to them the following speech.

“Gentlemen, Peers, and Deputies,—eight months have passed since, in this assembly, and in your presence, I accepted the throne, to which the national will, of which you were the organs, called me, and since I swore to observe faithfully the constitutional charter, with the modifications expressed in the declaration of the 7th of August, 1830, not to govern except by the laws, and according to the laws, to cause good and exact justice to be rendered to every man according to his right, and to act in everything with the sole object of the interest, the happiness, and the glory of the French people. I then told you, that, profoundly impressed with the full extent of the duties which this great act imposed upon me, I was conscious that I should fulfil them, and that it was with this full conviction I accepted the compact proposed to me.

“I like to repeat those solemn words which I pronounced on the 9th of August, because they are at once the invariable rule of my conduct, and the expression of the principles upon which I aspire to be judged by France and by posterity.

“Your session opened in the midst of great dangers. The terrible contest in which the nation

had just defended its laws, its rights, and its liberties, against an unjust aggression, had broken in pieces the resources of authority; and it was necessary to secure the maintenance of order by the re-establishment of public power. France was instantly covered with National Guards, formed spontaneously by the patriotic zeal of all the citizens, and organized by the authority of the government. That of Paris appeared again finer and more numerous than ever, and this admirable institution offered at once the means of stifling anarchy in the interior, and of repelling all aggression from without, to which our national independence might have been exposed. At the same time with the National Guard our brave army of the line was recomposed, and France may now look upon it with pride. Never was the levy of our young soldiers effected with so much promptitude and facility; and such is the patriotic ardour with which they are animated, that, scarcely ranged under our standards, whose glorious colours recall so many recollections dear to the country, they are no longer distinguishable from our veterans, and in no time were the French troops finer, better disciplined, and, I say it with confidence, animated with a better spirit than they are now.

“The labours of this great organization have not retarded the accomplishment of the promises of the charter. Already the greater part has been realized by the laws which you have voted, and which I have sanctioned. I have followed with anxiety, gentlemen, the course of your important labours, the whole of which exhibit talents, zeal, and courage, which will make



the epoch remarkable in history. France will not forget your devotion to the country in the moment of danger; and I shall always preserve the memory of the assistance which I have found in you, when the necessities of the state imposed on me the duty of requiring it. The next session will, I am confident, have but to continue your work, by completing it, and by preserving always the character of that great event of July, which guarantees for the future, by legal means, all the improvements which the country has a right to expect, and which separates for ever the destinies of France from a dynasty excluded from the nation's will.

“ After the shock which the social body underwent, it was difficult not to experience some new crisis, and we have passed through some painful ones during this session; but, thanks to the constant efforts which you have made to second mine,—thanks to the energetic devotedness of the people, to its patriotism, and to the indefatigable zeal of the National Guard and of the troops of the line, we have passed through them successfully; and if we have had to regret lamentable disorders, at least the consent of the country has approved the intentions of the authorities. The internal peace of the kingdom is gradually re-established, and the strength of government has progressively increased in proportion as the reign of the law has resumed its empire, and public safety has been consolidated. My government will continue to follow with firm steps this course in which you have so worthily supported it.

“ My ministers have constantly acquainted you with the state of

our diplomatic relations, and you have been informed of the circumstances which have determined me to make extraordinary armaments; like me you have recognized the necessity of them, and you will also participate in my sincere desire to see them speedily cease. The assurances which I receive from all quarters of the pacific dispositions of foreign Powers, give me the hope that their armies and ours may soon be reduced to the proportions of the state of peace; but till the negotiations which are on foot have acquired the development necessary to render this reduction possible, the attitude of France must be strong, and we must persevere in the measures which we have taken to make her respected, for peace is safe only with honour.

“ Our support, and the concurrence of the Great Powers of Europe, have secured the independence of Belgium, and its separation from Holland. If I have refused to yield to the wishes of the Belgic people, who offered me the crown for my second son, it is because I believed that this refusal was dictated by the interests of France, as well as by those of Belgium itself. But this people has a peculiar right to interest us, and it is of importance to us that it should be happy and free.

“ If, during the absence of the Chambers, unforeseen circumstances should oblige me again to appeal to your patriotic zeal, I shall do it with entire confidence. Always devoted to my country, no sacrifice will be too great in my eyes to maintain its honour or to defend its independence; but I have reason to hope that our state of peace will be consolidated, and that, far from my government re-



quiring new resources, we shall see credit, manufactures, and commerce, soon restore to us the prosperity which the country desired to reconquer with liberty, and which liberty cannot produce but with the aid of a Power that is strong, generous, and always national."

The prorogation was till the 15th of June, and although it was settled that it was to be followed by a dissolution, the dissolution was not announced for more than a month, M. Perrier's first step being to acquire information by queries contained in a circular to the prefects, in which he candidly told them, "that the government did not mean to be neutral in the elections, and did not wish the administration to be so any more than itself.\*" The Parisians, de-

---

\* The minister's queries were the following:—

"I have to request you to communicate to me your opinion upon the probable result of the ensuing election. I must beg of you, on this point, the most explicit frankness. The government should know all things that may enlighten, and not those that may flatter it.

"1. What is the general state of the public mind in your department, and what is the respective strength of the opinions which divide it, without counting the partisans of the fallen government; who have the greater influence and credit, those who adopt the principles professed by the government, or those who attack them, and form the opposition?

"2. What do you anticipate particularly in this respect from the electoral body, such as it is constituted by the new law?

"3. Who are the candidates brought forward either by the different localities or by the opposed parties? What is your opinion upon the chances of success of each of them? Upon their merits their social position, their political disposition? Conceal nothing from me upon the subject, and speak to me with a frankness equal to my discretion." He

prived of the Chambers, amused themselves in doing honour to Napoleon, and listening to the complaints of the heroes of July. The government, while it removed the emblems of the Bourbons, had further condescended to humour the populace by resolving to replace the statue of Buonaparte on the pillar of the Place Vendome. Until the design should be fulfilled, the populace thought it but right to act in the same spirit. It was the month of May, and flowers were plentiful. The populace collected round the pillar, hung garlands and crape upon the mouldings of its pedestal, one of the *artistes* being a lamplighter, and placed beside it two cypress trees, bearing inscriptions, one of which called for the restoration of the effigies of Napoleon to the insignia of the Legion of Honour, and the other for the repeal of the law which banished his family from France. This mummary formed the nucleus of a crowd, and was the cause of detached assem-

---

added in a subsequent passage of the circular, "It is our wish that the dissolution should produce a Chamber of which the majority will adopt and support them, and will faithfully follow the examples of the Chamber which perfected the charter, offered the crown to the king, shared the danger and honour of the great events of July, the benefits of which it consolidated. This rule should determine the preference of the administration between the divers candidates. You are aware, however, that an exclusive preference is not to be given to shades. An honest man, devoted to the king and to the charter, is always a good deputy; and should there even be deputies apparently preferable, yet, when they have little chance of being elected, the administration must not insist upon supporting them. Guided by general interests, it is not to take the initiative of hostility against any one, but admit all such as do not attack it."



blages, which danced round the column, singing the Marsellois hymn, or raising shouts for "the republic," and the "Sovereign people." The government journals maintained that, under all this, lay hid some deep political conspiracy; but, at all events, if no other mischief was done, it was intolerable that industrious people should be compelled to shut up their shops whenever mobs chose to turn out. The military at last interfered, and the National Guards mercilessly swept away the faded chaplets of mob gratitude.

Amid the immediate effervescence of the revolution, the Chamber had decreed that the surviving "heroes of July" should receive an honourable decoration, as one had formerly been given to the conquerors of the Bastile. The commission appointed to manage the details, had returned the names of no fewer than 1,500 persons as entitled to this mark of distinction. The distribution was to be made by the hands of the king himself. The knights of the new order, like all other knights, were to take an oath; the reverse of the legend of the cross bore that it was given by the king; and government had even changed the colour of the riband as proposed by the commission, to prevent confusion with the ribands of some other and older orders. All these alterations roused the republican wrath of the heroes. They would accept of no honours from the hand of a king, who had nothing to do with what preceded his own elevation to power; they had been conquerors, before he was a king. The oath, again, was an act of feudal homage, a symbol of vassalage, while the inscription was an arbitrary change

of a national recompense, decreed by the representatives of the people, into a mere royal favour, bestowed by a king. The insulted heroes convened a public meeting of their own body. They unanimously voted that the king's order should be rejected; and, as they happened to find an old soldier of the guards who wore the medal awarded to the victors of the Bastile, they resolved, with equal unanimity, that to his hands the distribution of the new decoration should be intrusted. As the crosses were beyond his power and theirs, they satisfied themselves with a simple riband. The royal decorations were delivered to the mayors of the different quarters, to be duly distributed, and, according to the *Moniteur*, more than four-fifths of the heroes disclaimed the mad proceedings of their companions. The latter, however, celebrated their independence by a public banquet, at which they toasted the speedy arrival of a republic. One of them was said to have given "Death to Louis Philippe." After the dinner, they got up a riot, which was put down by the military and followed by arrests.

The king quitted, for a time, these unpleasant scenes, and cultivated his popularity, during a great part of May, by making a tour through the eastern departments of the kingdom. His progress was accompanied by reviews, addresses, festivals, and balls. It was only at Metz that anything occurred to mar the harmony between the citizen king and his subjects. The National Guards, in their armed capacity, as well as the civic and municipal authorities, had their addresses, in which they treated of all manner of political



questions. Those of Metz read his majesty a lecture on the laws which France still required to consolidate her liberties, and particularly the destruction of the peerage. "Among those laws, the most decisive for the future prospects of France, is that which is to organize the second branch of the legislative power. The almost unanimous wish of our city is—" Here the king interrupted the reader with, "The national guard ought not to occupy itself with political questions; these did not concern them; upon them they have no advice to give." The officer answered they were giving no advice, but only expressing a wish. His majesty rejoined, "The national guard can have no wish on this subject. They are forbidden to deliberate on such matters. I will hear nothing more of this kind."

The capital still continued to be subject to perpetually-recurring disturbances, requiring the incessant interference of the military and the national guards. Even the courts of justice were not saved from scenes of disgraceful riot. They were regularly filled, on the trials of persons charged with having been engaged in former disturbances, with numerous friends of the accused, who insulted the judges, terrified the witnesses, and sometimes compelled an adjournment of the proceedings. They applauded such speeches, testimonies, and opinions, as were favourable to their friends; interrupted with groans and hisses what displeased them. The judges frequently ordered the courts to be cleared, but the next crowd that entered, repeated the same conduct, while insulted justice did not venture to

punish the contempt. From the 13th to the 18th of June, was one continued scene of commotion. Mobs of unemployed men paraded the streets, raising sometimes seditious and sometimes absurd cries, now shouting the name of Napoleon, instead of that of Orleans, now bawling for work and bread, attacking the houses and persons of all whom they chose to denominate Jesuits or Carlists. When driven from one street, they moved into another, quitted a quay for a faubourg, or a faubourg for a quay, and resisted, with sticks and stones, the interference of the military to execute the riot act. Many arrests took place; but the courts were mobbed, and the juries almost uniformly acquitted. These riotous assemblies were attributed, in a great measure, to the want of work, which, ever since the revolution of the preceding year, had filled Paris with a host of idle men, while the events and spirit of that revolution itself, which they believed to have been their own work, had taught them to consider their own class as the very last that ought to be disregarded. They held that the government which they created was good for nothing, if it did not furnish them with employment, or comfort without employment. But, among these mobs, were always to be found young men of a better condition of life, frequently decorated with the riband of July, and palpably instigating the angry passions of the populace. On these ringleaders the police became at last unwilling to lay their hands, as it was useless to arrest them; they would only make inflammatory speeches on their trial, and be sure to be acquitted, for it would not be safe to condemn a



hero of the revolution. After a five nights' riot, the populace at length got tired, and allowed the capital and the national guards to enjoy another interval of repose.

In the mean time, on the 1st of June, a royal ordinance had appeared, dissolving the Chamber, and directing a general election, under the new law. The electoral colleges were to assemble on the 5th of July; the Chamber was to meet for the despatch of business, on the 9th of August. The opposition, who had already found themselves in a minority, hoped that the greater extension now given to the franchise, though much more confined than their policy had recommended, would enable them to secure an indisputable preponderance. The journals and associations of Paris brought into action all the resources of violence and abuse, as well as their lists of favouritism and proscription, which had been played off so successfully against the ministers of Charles X. They strained every nerve to rouse the desire of unbounded popular power—the love of glory to lead to war, —the love of freedom to march into Italy and Belgium—the sense of shame that the opportunity had not yet been seized to wipe off the past disasters of France, and extend her power once more over former conquests. Democracy at home, and war abroad, were the objects of all their vows. They found themselves, however, greatly disappointed in their expectations. The elections gave a decided majority in favour of the ministry, or, at least, in opposition to the party of the *mouvement*. Of the thirteen deputies returned for Paris, the ministerial party carried

eight. Pledges, however, were very generally demanded of the candidate, and as generally given, to abolish the hereditary peerage. The minister himself when asked to pledge himself on this point by the electors of Troyes, for which place he was returned, declined to make any declaration of his opinions, and several other supporters of his government followed his example; but the current of popular opinion, or of popular prejudice, ran so strong against the peerage, that few candidates ventured to declare themselves in its favour. On the other hand a very large proportion of them volunteered their services to abolish the peerage, or, where they would fain have remained silent, found it necessary to speak out, and bind themselves to become fellow-labourers in the same work. The bar of Paris, with M. Mauguin at its head, determined, after solemn deliberation, that the system of the peerage must be entirely altered. Except upon this point, the general election, and the new constituency did not add perceptibly to the parliamentary strength of the war and republican party.

To the excitement of the elections succeeded immediately new disorders in Paris. The 14th of July being the anniversary of the destruction of the Bastille, the populace and students resolved to celebrate it by planting trees of liberty; while the government, made acquainted with these designs, determined to resist and prevent them. The military in the capital were increased; the national guards were again under array. They occupied in great force the site of the Bastille, and the Place de Greve, which the populace had intended to be two of



the principal sites of their liberal horticulture. The police, moreover, carried off the trees which young men were dragging in from the neighbourhood for the ceremony. A more resolute body cut down a tree in the Champs Elysées, and had brought it to the Place Louis XVI, to plant it on the spot where a guillotine once had stood, before the police and national guards could reach them. They were forthwith despoiled of their tree, which was thrown into the Seine, but it was only by force, and not until wounds had been inflicted, that they were dispersed. Among the rioters were persons in the uniform of the national guards, and armed. The riot, like all others, was followed by a multitude of arrests, but the arrests, as usual, were not effectively followed up. In the provinces, the attempts of the populace thus to commemorate one of the greatest triumphs, were more successful. In many places lawless mobs planted their trees of liberty, in the presence of the civil and military authorities, who were either unable or unwilling to prevent them. In one instance the military refused to obey the orders of the civil power to disperse the bands who erected and danced around this memorial of revolutionary excesses, and who proceeded from these orgies to attack a body of peaceable citizens who entertained a different opinion from themselves regarding the propriety of such proceedings. It was, perhaps, from an apprehension that this spirit of the populace might show itself in still more serious forms during the anniversary of the great week of July which was now approaching, and from a wish to have the presence of the legislative body to

overawe it, or supply it with other materials to distract its attention, that ministers resolved to assemble the Chambers sooner than had been originally announced. They had been convoked for the 9th of August; they were now called together for the 23rd of July. Possibly, too, the ministry may have wished to open the session before the pleasant feeling inspired by a sort of foreign conquest had died away. In the beginning of the year the French government had found occasion to complain of the maltreatment of certain French subjects at Lisbon by the Portuguese authorities. Complaints of the same sort had been made by Britain, and the British ministry had demanded and obtained satisfaction by sending out an armed squadron. France followed the example, but to much better purpose. A French fleet was dispatched to Lisbon. Having received, instead of immediate reparation for the alleged injuries, an offer to treat, the admiral forced the entrance of the Tagus. The Portuguese government was then compelled to yield to the terms which he dictated, and, as a punishment for what he termed their obstinacy, he actually carried off their fleet. Of all the events that could have happened to France, that of seeing an enemy's fleet brought into her ports, was by far the most novel, and excellently calculated to form a clap-trap in a royal speech. Ministers had likewise brought about other events, connected with foreign politics, which promised to be useful to them with the new Chamber. When M. Lafitte resigned, Austrian troops were marching towards the papal states to put down the insurrections which had broken out



in the dominions of his holiness, as well as those which had appeared in Lombardy. M. Perrier had obtained by negotiation, that they should not continue to occupy the papal territory, while the pope was to introduce amelioration into his civil policy; and the Austrians, after restoring his authority, had retired from Romagna. It so happened, too, that the Conference of London, on whose deliberations depended the fate of Belgium, had determined that part at least of the fortresses which had been raised, at great expense, for the very purpose of protecting her against France, should be demolished, on the ground that the new kingdom would be too poor to maintain them, and that, as its neutrality was to be guaranteed, they would be unnecessary. Although France was no party formally, at least, to that determination, it was very capable of being represented as a tribute paid to her power, and a positive advantage gained towards any military measures in that quarter, which she might choose to undertake.

On the 23rd of July, the king opened the session of the new chamber with the following speech.

“Messieurs Peers and Deputies—I am happy to be among you in this place: here France has received my oaths. Deeply impressed with the duties which they impose upon me, I shall always rest upon the national will, of which you are the constitutional organs; and I expect from you that frank and entire co-operation which must give to my government the strength, without which it cannot answer the expectation of the nation.

“I said, gentlemen, that the charter would be a truth; what I

have said has been accomplished. The charter is the constitutional monarchy, with all its conditions loyally maintained, with all its consequences frankly accepted. It is true, that by the uniform action of all the powers of the state, we should put an end to those prolonged agitations which feed the criminal hopes of those who dream of the return of the late dynasty, or of those who still dream of the chimera of a republic. Divided respecting the object, they agree in the will to overturn, no matter at what price, the political order founded by the revolution of July. Their efforts will be disconcerted or punished.

“In calling me to the throne, France desired that the royal authority should be national. It did not desire that it should be feeble. A government without strength cannot suit a great nation. I have just taken a tour through France. The testimonies of affection which I have received in these journeys have deeply affected my heart. Its wishes are present to my mind; you will assist me in fulfilling them. Order will be protected, liberty guaranteed, every factious attempt confounded and repressed, Thus will revive that confidence in the future, which alone can restore the confidence of the country. It is to attain this end—to consolidate more and more the constitutional monarchy, that I have caused the several projects of law to be prepared which will be laid before you.

“In that which has for its object the decision of a great constitutional question reserved by the charter for the examination of the chambers, you will, I hope, perceive that I always seek to make our institutions harmonize with



the interest and the wishes of the nation, enlightened by experience, and matured by time.

“You will also have to examine, conformably to the promises of the charter, the projects of law destined to complete the departmental and municipal organization, to determine the responsibility of ministers, and of the other agents of government, and to regulate the liberty of instruction.

“Other projects of law—on the recruiting of the army, on the penal code, on the finances, and divers public interests—will also be laid before you. I acknowledge the whole extent of the distresses which the present commercial crisis causes the nation to suffer. I am afflicted at them, and admire the courage with which they are supported. I hope they are approaching to their close, and that the consolidation of order will soon produce the security necessary for the circulation of capital, and will restore to our commerce and manufactures that activity which, under a government always guided by the national interests, can never be interrupted except for a moment.

“The situation of our finances is satisfactory; if our wants are great, abundant resources are prepared to provide for them.

“The budgets, for the service of 1831 and 1832, will be presented to you early in the session. Reductions have been made in several branches of the administration. They would be more important, if the increase of our means of defence and the development of our military force had not hitherto imposed on us great sacrifices. I shall hasten to diminish the burden of them, as soon as I shall have acquired the cer-

tainty of being able to do so without risking the dignity and safety of France. This certainty depends on a general disarming. France desires it, the governments of Europe feel the necessity of it, the interest of all requires it.

“I have the satisfaction to announce to you already, that I have not had occasion to employ all the resources, which the chambers had placed at my disposal.

“Since the revolution of July, France has resumed in Europe the rank which belongs to her, and henceforth nothing can deprive her of it. Never was her independence better guaranteed. Our national guards, who are equal to our army; our armies, the worthy depositories of the inheritance of our ancient glory, would defend that independence, as they have lately protected internal peace and liberty. I have only to congratulate myself on the friendly relations, which foreign governments maintain with mine.

“It was our duty to seek to draw closer the natural and ancient bonds of friendship which unite France and the United States of North America. A treaty has just put an end to disputes which have been too long carried on between two countries connected by so many recollections and sympathies. Other treaties have been concluded with the republics of Mexico and Hayti. All these acts will be communicated to you as soon as they shall be ratified, in order that the financial stipulations which they contained may be submitted to you for your inspection.

“I have given orders to increase the number of vessels employed to insure the execution of the law passed in the last session, for the



effectual suppression of the negro slave trade.

“Conformably to my demands, the troops of the emperor of Austria have evacuated the Roman states. A real amnesty—the abolition of confiscation—important changes in the administrative and judicial system; such are the ameliorations which, being secured to these states—make us hope that their tranquillity will not be again disturbed—that the balance of Europe will be strengthened by the maintenance of their independence.

“The kingdom of the Netherlands, as constituted by the treaties of 1814 and 1815, has ceased to exist. The independence of Belgium, and its separation from Holland, have been recognized by the great Powers. The king of the Belgians will not be a member of the German Confederation. The fortresses erected to threaten France, and not to protect Belgium, will be demolished. A neutrality recognized by Europe, and the friendship of France, insure to our neighbours an independence of which we have been the first support.

“The power which governs in Portugal had insulted French subjects—it had disregarded, with respect to them, the rights of justice and of humanity; to obtain reparation, demanded in vain, our ships of war have appeared before the Tagus. I have just received the news that they have forced the entrance. The satisfaction hitherto refused has been offered to us. The Portuguese men-of-war are in our power, and the tri-coloured flag flies on the walls of Lisbon.

“A sanguinary and inveterate

struggle is prolonged in Poland. This struggle causes lively emotion in the midst of Europe. I have exerted myself to hasten the termination of it. After having offered my mediation, I have invited that of the great Powers. I have desired to stop the effusion of blood, to preserve the south of Europe from the scourge which war propagates, and above all, to secure to Poland, whose courage has revived the ancient affections of France, that nationality which has resisted time and its vicissitudes.

“You will, doubtless, judge that in these difficult negotiations, the true interests of France—the interests of its prosperity, of its power, and of its honour, have been defended with perseverance and dignity. Europe is now convinced of the rectitude of our intentions, and of the sincerity of our wishes for the maintenance of peace; it is also convinced of our strength, and it knows how we should support a war if we were driven to it by unjust aggressions.

“It is by persisting in the system of policy hitherto pursued that we shall succeed in securing and in making our country enjoy the benefits of the revolution, which has secured its liberties; and shall preserve it from new commotions, which would endanger, at the same time, its own existence, and the civilization of the world.

“We are on the eve, gentlemen, of great anniversaries. I shall see you with satisfaction join me in their solemnities. May these serious and affecting commemorations awaken sentiments of union and concord, which, a year ago, alone decided the triumph, the remembrance of which they celebrate.”



"The great anniversaries" mentioned by his majesty referred to the ceremonies and rejoicings with which all Paris was preparing to commemorate the revolution of the preceding July, and they were celebrated with all the variety which French fancy could invent. The 27th was dedicated to a funeral service to the memory of those who had fallen, and the king himself assisted at laying the foundation stone of a monument intended to record their fame. The following days were given up to all manner of amusements, and care was taken to provide it abundantly for the populace. There was unceasing firing of cannon, waving of banners, and military music; there were boat races on the Seine, horse races, foot races, and races of horses without riders, in the Champ de Mars. Agile performers crossed the river on the tight rope; temporary theatres were erected in different parts of the city, for exhibiting military pantomimes, gymnastic exercises, rope-dancing, puppets, vaudevilles, and farces; various localities were set apart for dancing, and provided with magnificent orchestras. All these entertainments were continued through the night by the glare of illuminations adorned with the discharge of fire-works. Bread, wine, and sausages were distributed to the poor. The whole terminated with a review of the garrison and national guards of Paris, and without any riot.

The opening of the Chamber of Paris exhibited another display of triumph, of a much more questionable character. When the peers met, they found, to their astonishment, placed on the platform of the president's chair, a group of Austrian standards, hanging

over statues of victory. It turned out that these were the standards which Buonaparte had sent to the conservative senate, after the surrender of General Mack at Ulm in 1805. When the allies were in Paris in 1815, all the Austrian standards had been reclaimed. The answer was, that they had been burned by the soldiers at the Hotel des Invalides. This had been a mean and paltry lie. The marquis de Semonville, the grand referendary, now made a speech, in which he informed the peers, that, while the Austrians had been told the standards had been destroyed, he himself, cognizant of the fraud, had concealed them in a cellar under the Luxemburg palace, where they had remained hidden for sixteen years, till he now brought them forth to regenerated France. "The conqueror," said he, "suspended them from this vault, under which were seated at the command of his voice so many companions of his glory. They had every right to partake in the *spolia opima*, which the temple, wherein our veterans prayed for the fortune of France, was not sufficiently capacious to contain. On one day fortune was faithless, and the flames of blazing altars raised by their grief devoured that harvest of laurels which their mutilated arms were too weak to defend. Gentlemen, at this hour of adversity a courageous foresight preserved for this palace its noblest ornament, and placed it in the hands of your referendary. He, after a lapse of seventeen years, now renders up his trust. An inviolable asylum formed in the vaults of this hall has protected this treasure from every search. Vainly during this long space of time have the most authoritative researches endeavour-



ed to penetrate the secret. It would have been culpable to reveal it, as long as we were liable to the demands of haughty foreigners. No one in this atmosphere of honour is capable of so great a weakness, and the idea of such an indiscretion in any one of my colleagues never entered my mind. But, gentlemen, when France has re-assumed her arms, a thousand times more difficult was it to defer the restoration of these trophies." The most melancholy thing was, that a prince of the blood, the duke of Orleans, had been tutored to play a part in this despicable exhibition, and to make a speech in "a concatenation accordingly." His royal highness followed the referendary, declaring, "to remind me of my duties towards my country, I shall have no occasion to turn my eyes to these trophies, the imperishable monuments of the former victories of our armies, and the pledges of the future successes that await them, if we are again compelled to fight for our institutions and independence, or for the maintenance of our interests or national sympathies. Whenever France makes an appeal to her children, she will find me the first among them, at the head of that youth of whom I am so proud of being a contemporary, and who will, I am confident, realize the hopes placed in them by their country, and maintain its glory and its grandeur. May these standards, gained by several who now hear me, and preserved by the patriotic solicitude of the grand referendary, remind every one, both within and out of this Chamber, of the efforts France is capable of under the colours which the country has so gloriously reconquered, and of which I, after

the king, will ever be the firmest supporter and the most zealous defender." Austria might well have taken offence at so deliberate an insult, had not the mean trickery, and immeasurable absurdity of the whole story, rendered the ridicule and contempt which it excited the fittest punishment for those who were concerned in it. It was anxiously declared that it had been the unauthorized exploit of a few individuals. The king himself was said to have been ignorant of it, and not to have known even that his own son was to play a part in this political farce, on so public a stage; and his royal highness was made to explain to the president of the council how he had been drawn into the absurdity.

The election of the bureaux, that is of the president and secretaries of the standing committees which is the first occupation of the Chamber of Deputies, showed the strength of the ministerial party. Out of eighteen, the opposition carried only six. But the great trial of strength was to take place in the choice of the president of the Chamber — although not a trial between the ministry and the opposition. The friends of M. Lafitte, who could not, on general questions, be ranked with the party of the *mouvement*, had determined to make him speaker. M. Perrier, on the other hand, made it a point that M. Lafitte should not be speaker, and declared that he would resign, if the late minister was chosen. The reasons why he chose to stake his power on such a question, were not clearly explained, but they probably arose partly from the shades of difference in policy between M. Lafitte and himself, and still more from the particular relation in



which they had formerly stood to each other. They had both been in the ministry immediately after the revolution of July. They had divided the honours of the Chamber, the one being president, and the other vice-president. The Cabinet had split in opinion; M. Perrier, the more moderate of the two, had retired from office, along with his friends, and left the government in the hands of M. Lafitte, whose stronger inclination not openly to resist the *mouvement* faction, had since produced so many symptoms of weakness, and had finally led to his own resignation. M. Perrier might therefore feel himself justified in deciding not to continue minister with a Chamber so constituted, as to support, in opposition to him, even for the president's chair, a politician, for differing from whom he himself had ceased to be a minister. His triumph would have been easy and certain, if a pure *mouvement* candidate had been proposed; but against M. Lafitte his task was more difficult, that gentleman being supported not merely by all the regular opposition, because in this question he was against the ministry, but likewise by a large number of members who could not justly be accused of being adherents of the extravagant party, and who did not think that M. Lafitte's conceding spirit towards it, arising, as they imagined, more from policy than opinion, should unfit him for presiding in the Chamber. The minister was not even very fortunate in his candidate, M. Girod de l'Ain, who hitherto had filled only the subordinate office of prefect of the metropolitan police. The election took place on the 1st of August. On the first scrutiny neither of

the two candidates had an absolute majority of the members present, and the ministerial candidate had a majority of only three above his opponent. The number present being 355, the absolute majority was 178. M. Girod de l'Ain had 171, and M. Lafitte 168, the remaining votes having been thrown away upon other candidates.\* On the second scrutiny, the number of voters had increased to 358, the absolute majority of which was 180. The ministerial candidate had 181 votes, and M. Lafitte 176, one vote having been thrown away. M. Girod de l'Ain was thus elected president, but he had only one vote more than the absolute majority, and only five votes more than his antagonist. Of the four vice-presidents, the first elected, M. Dupont de l'Eure, approached nearer to the party of M. Lafitte than to the ministry, and had one vote more than had carried the election of the president. The other three, M. Beranger, M. Dupin, and M. Delesert were much more ministerial men.

M. Perrier considered the majority by which the election of his candidate had been carried as a defeat, while his friends complained of treachery among those on whom

---

\* A vote was disregarded on account of an ill-natured impertinence which it contained, the deputy who gave it in, having written, instead of M. J. Lafitte, M. J. Faillitte, in allusion to the pecuniary embarrassments in which that gentleman's banking establishment had become involved. It is a good illustration of the secrecy of the ballot, that this circumstance was mentioned in the Chamber, so soon as the result of the scrutiny was declared, and a member moved, that the vote should be read. Nobody supported him.



they were entitled to rely. He gave in his resignation which was followed by those of Sebastiani, baron Louis, and count Montalivet. Soult was willing to remain at the war-office, and de Rigny in the admiralty. The king was miserably perplexed; he entreated the minister to reconsider the step which he was taking. The minister did so, but persevered in it. Count Mole was charged on the 2nd of August to form a new ministry. On the third of August, while the port-feuilles were in the course of distribution, intelligence was received of the Dutch government having given notice that the armistice with Belgium was at an end, and that the Dutch army would immediately invade the hostile territory. Along with this intelligence came a letter from Leopold, the newly elected king of the Belgians, praying immediate succour from France; and in truth it was soon seen, that, without such assistance his royalty and his kingdom were at an end. This occurrence, which held out to the French government the opportunity of doing a very popular thing in marching an army to the assistance of Belgium, a proceeding, moreover, not in opposition to the other great Powers, but in execution of their united determination that there should be no fighting between Holland and her neighbour, induced M. Perrier and his friends to recal their resignations. On the 4th of August they were reinstated in their offices, and within a very brief space of time, an army of 40,000 or 50,000 men under the command of marshal Gerard crossed the frontier to interpose between the combatants. Notwithstanding all their expedition, the French troops did not

arrive a single day too soon. The Dutch army, wherever the Belgians waited to face them, had scattered them in utter route, almost without the necessity of fighting. King Leopold himself hastened to the field, but only to see his new subjects fly, and his towns fall. The invader had forced his way to the immediate vicinity of Brussels, without serious opposition, and the fall of the capital and of Leopold could not have been delayed for twenty-four hours, when the arrival of the French divisions changed the scene. A convention was immediately concluded, by which the king of Holland, who declared he had no wish to go to war with any of his allies, recalled his army within the limits which it had previously occupied. Nothing could have been more favourable in itself for the French ministry, and they were entitled to the praise of having acted with great decision; but its beneficial consequences to them were in a great measure neutralized, by the jealousy with which the other powers regarded it. They admitted, it was true, that, although France, who had no right to execute the determination of the Conference at her own hand, had marched an army without receiving any authority, or making any communication, she was justified in doing so by the urgent nature of the crisis, which did not admit, as the event proved, of a single day's delay. But, at the same time, as the Dutch troops had immediately retired, the Conference insisted that the French army, likewise, should be instantly recalled. The French ministry had no fair ground for refusal. The return of the troops not only removed the gag which the con-



tinued occupation of Belgium must have put on the declarations of the war party, but exposed the government to the new reproach of giving up, from dishonourable respect to foreigners, an advantageous position which it had actually gained.

The official announcement of the determination of M. Perrier and his colleagues to remain in office stated that they had resolved to await the decision of the Chamber on the address to the royal speech before renewing their resignation. The result shewed that, if the election of the speaker had made the minister doubtful of his preponderance in the Chamber, he had himself to blame for the selection of such a question for the trial of strength. Undoubtedly, too, all the moderate men must have felt that the moment at which military movements were actually taking place, was not the time to weaken a government, whose declared policy was to prevent the conflagration which might easily be lighted up in circumstances so delicate. The opposition moved a variety of objections which were all rejected. They principally related to the foreign policy of the government, and they all went to pledge France more or less directly, to take arms on the side of every insurrection that might break out in any state. One amendment, on which ministers, it was said, were resolved to peril their existence, turned on a single word. The address, as proposed, spoke thus of Poland: "A sentiment inspired by the fate of unhappy and heroic Poland profoundly moves us. France thanks your majesty for having tendered your mediation. The voice of your diplomacy cannot make itself heard too often or

with too much energy in behalf of a people whose restoration to the rank of nations is desired so earnestly by all generous souls, and is demanded by the interests of France and by all the true friends of European civilization." M. Bignon moved an amendment: "In your majesty's affecting expression as to the misfortunes of the Poles, the Chamber of Deputies finds with satisfaction a certainty most grateful to their feelings, that the nationality of the Poles will not be destroyed." M. Bodin, again, moved that, in the amendment itself the word "hope" should be substituted for certainty." M. Perrier declared, "that he had no objection to 'hope,' but he must insist on 'certainty' being expunged. The government had done all in its power to terminate desirably the struggle in Poland. To go farther would be to determine a war before hand; for the government could not, with any regard to its dignity, abandon what it had affirmed as a certainty, till it had exerted every possible means of making it a certainty. Nay, suppose war to take place, what man, or what body of men, would declare its result to be a certainty. While the Chamber was divided between these two words, a middle term was happily struck out, viz. the word, "assurance," and was ultimately adopted, with the consent of ministers, as being thought much weaker than "certainty," something stronger than "hope." The vote upon the whole address gave ministers a majority of 282 against 73.

In the course of the discussions on the address M. Perrier stated distinctly the principles on which he intended to conduct his domestic policy, and his idea of what the



late revolution was, and required. "It is to the sacred boundaries of the charter of 1830, that we have limited the exercise of our authority; we are desirous of going to its utmost limits, but never to go beyond them. Did the revolution of July desire more than the charter? No one dares say so. It came, not to recommence, but to terminate our first revolution; nor was it a signal given to France and to the world, calling upon all to engage in hazardous experiments, and interminable combats. It ought to assure us a definitive government, and the charter is the only programme of that government. What, then, is necessary to be faithful to the object of the revolution of July? To put the charter loyally and frankly into execution. That is what we have done. Let us not deceive ourselves: beyond the Charter, beyond the constitutional royalty, that is to say, beyond the government of the three Powers which concur in the making of all the laws and institutions, there is nothing which really belongs to the revolution of July. It stopped there, and all that is sought to be given you beyond this, as the consequences of that revolution, are only the first fruits of a new one. Now France loudly and daily declares that it entertains a horror for all new revolutions. In proceeding thus from consequence to consequence, where should we arrive? At the destruction of society. Unfortunate are we, if obedient to a blind logic, our eyes constantly fixed on a chimerical futurity, we neglect the fruit of our victories to run incessantly after impracticable conquests! It is only in resisting, while it is yet time, this invasion of consequences,

always demanded by imprudent friends, that a new government can establish for itself a firm futurity. France has this desire, for she has now need of repose and stability. After the immense interval she has passed through during the space of a year, what she has need of is to take breath. Her habits, as you may often remark, are yet in arrear of her laws, and it is only in a distant futurity that she will find insufficient the institutions which she has just obtained. It is, then, necessary to preserve her from that too precocious increase which enervates and destroys the social body. In that lies the duty my colleagues and I have imposed on ourselves, and it is to the severe and laborious mission we have devoted ourselves. Now, Gentlemen, it is for you to complete our work. During your absence we have been able to undertake and maintain a difficult contest; but now when you are assembled, we can do nothing without the concurrence of your efforts and confidence."

M. Guizot attacked still more intrepidly the movement party, and indirectly the wavering ministry of Lafitte. "They call for an interregnum, — for a provisional government, for a constitution altogether new, having nothing in common with the charter, not even the name; — for universal suffrage, — for contempt of all existing laws, and the necessity of making them all anew, — and finally, for a complete reconstruction of social order. As to external affairs, they exclaim loudly for war, — general war, — war of principles. On these men has been conferred the title of the republican party. I will none of them: for monarchy is the only government congenial to France;



but I will not do a republic the injury of giving its name to such a party, incapable alike of amendment or repentance. The revolution of July contains every thing that was good, legitimate, and national, in our first revolution; and it had moreover, converted all that into government. See, then, gentlemen, the contest to which you have to lend yourselves. It is a contest between the revolution of July, — that is to say, between every thing good, legitimate, and national, from 1789 to 1830, on the one hand,—and between the bad revolutionary party, that is to say, the Rump of our first revolution, or every thing bad, illegitimate, and anti-national, from 1789 to 1830, on the other hand. Do not delude yourselves by investing such bad things with fine names. These are really the two contending parties, and it is for you to decide which of them shall be victorious. Among the sincere, enlightened, honest friends of the revolution of July, there are some who think that we ought to keep measures with this party,—that there is need of its alliance,—that it is necessary to have it in our ranks as far off as we can, even at the extremity if it be possible,—that, in a word, we must, of necessity, make concessions to it, in order not to alienate it from us. There are, on the contrary, those who think that these are men whose challenge we must accept; that this party in our ranks will corrupt, ruin, dishonour us, in the eyes of Europe. These, gentlemen, are the two courses between which you have to choose. You have no middle course open to you. That which has tormented France for a year past is uncertainty and indecision—the doubt as to who is

the friend of the revolution, who the enemy of it. France expects that you will choose frankly and directly between these two courses. Upon the manner in which you make this choice depends the accomplishment of your mission. If you do not make the choice which France expects, if you do not adopt a plain and distinctly marked system, you fall again into all the uncertainties, the vacillations, the *pelemele* with which France has been tired and wearied for the last year.”

The question of the peerage next engaged the attention of the Chamber. At the settlement of the government subsequent on the revolution of the preceding year, the peers had been treated with very little respect at the hands of the Deputies, who, by a simple vote of their own, had annulled all the peerages created by Charles X. The popular spirit which had gone abroad was unfavourable to any thing hereditary in political arrangements. That quality had been secured for the crown; but the cry of the day had been for “republican institutions” to surround and support that hereditary throne; and not even the example of the Roman Senate could have brought France to regard a hereditary peerage, vested with privileges of legislation, as a republican institution. The Chamber of Deputies, however, did not think the period of popular excitement and control at which they framed the new charter, a fit occasion for examining this question; but they had added to the charter a supplementary provision that those of its articles, which regulated the creation of peers, and the duration of their privileges, should be revised in the Session of 1831.



This was a constitutional engagement, which could not be evaded. Although it did not point out any particular extent of change, popular opinion had decided that, at least, the abolition of the hereditary quality of the peerage was a necessary "developement" of the principles of the late revolution. This opinion had been fully manifested during the general election, and the minister found himself compelled to yield to it, though he yielded reluctantly. Proposals had already been made in the Chamber that the very name of peers should be abolished; that the second Chamber, if there was to be a second Chamber, should be called a senate, and that it should be, in part, at least, if not wholly, an elective body.\* The ministerial

project went no farther than circumstances rendered imperative. In introducing the bill, M. Perrier called on the Chamber to remember, that all that the new charter had reserved for revision was the twenty-third article. Every thing else was already determined by the charter. They could not entertain any question whether a House of Peers should exist, or what should be its powers in legislation. It was already established in the body of the constitution; its relations and attributes were defined by twelve other articles of the charter, and the task of revision was confined to these three points, the mode of creating peers—their number—the hereditary transmission of their powers and privileges. In regard to the first, the bill enacted, that the nomination of the peers should belong to the king, for an elective peerage would be inconsistent with the constitutional monarchy. "Constitutional monarchy," said the minister, "carries within itself a principle of durability, and a principle of change, and to each of the two legislative estates, it entrusts the keeping of one of these principles. To insure durability is the characteristic duty of the first; change belongs to the second. Hence the essential distinction in their origin and composition. Instead of reasoning from the one to the other on principles of analogy, we ought to reason upon a principle of opposition. If popular election be the natural parent of the one, a royal creation is the proper source of the other." In regard likewise to the number of the peers, the bill proposed that it should be unlimited, for the power of guiding the Chamber of Peers by new creations was to be held as corre-

---

\* Two individuals petitioned the Chamber of Deputies for permission to cite one of its members before a tribunal of correctional police, to answer some complaint which they had against him. The member was the marquis Gaetan de Rochefoucauld, descended from one of the oldest and noblest families of France. All titles, not previously restored by Napoleon, had been revived by the Bourbons, although they bestowed no legislative privileges. When the report of the committee on petitions was brought up, recommending that the prayer of the petitioners should be granted, a M. Marchal said, "I propose a slight change in the wording of the resolution of the committee. In a country where equality is so dear as in France, and above all, after the revolution of 1830, I believe we must introduce a slight change. The proposition of your commission is thus couched. The Chamber authorizes Mouret and Camus to proceed against the marquis Gaetan de la Rochefoucauld. I propose to put it thus:—'Authorizes Sieurs Mouret and Camus to proceed against Sieur Gaetan de la Rochefoucauld, and to leave out the title of marquis.'"

This amendment was put to the vote and adopted.



sponding to the power of dissolving the Chamber of Deputies.

On the third and most important topic, the bill proposed to enact that "the dignity of the peerage is not transmissible by descent," a sacrifice which M. Perrier frankly acknowledged ministers had brought themselves to make with regret, and only from a necessity which they could not control. He considered it to be fully proved both by the theory of limited monarchy, and by all experience, that the hereditary succession of the peerage contained in itself a conservative principle, the most solid support of the throne, and a principle of independence which was the best guarantee for liberty. But unfortunately a government could not confine itself to the wisdom of theory and the results of general experience, "or march across a country, like a blind abstraction." It was necessitated to regard not only what it might consider to be in itself good for a free state, but what practical policy best suited the state such as it existed. "A wise government consults the facts which exist around it, and in place of immolating realities to principles, or principles to realities, it exerts itself to mingle them together by approximation. One reality then is manifest to us all at present, that is the universal repugnance to the hereditary succession of the peerage. Just or unjust, rational or irrational, it exists, it presses upon us, it will be satisfied. An opinion has been pronounced—an opinion by far too widely spread to be either overlooked or despised, when, in other respects, it proposes no violation of justice. It is such an opinion as when it relates to the affairs of government always,

perhaps imperatively, commands some species of deference. It is more especially due at a period when institutions, as yet scarcely brought forth, want the public favour, for which no reverend antiquity supplies the substitute. It is at such a period that we ought to reflect that institutions, however excellent, cannot be imposed upon a people by mere force, and against its will. It were a most dangerous and unprofitable experiment which would extinguish, at the risk of the greatest calamities, that sympathy which henceforth ought to exist between the nation and its government. Since a constitutional independence, which ought to be regarded in theory as the protectress of public liberty, is confounded in the imagination of the people with the ancient aristocratic power, the oppressor of our civil liberties—since our duty, our absolute necessity, is to consult the popular impression, we propose to you, as ministers charged to collect the public opinions, and to satisfy them in all that is not contrary to justice—we propose to you, as the depositaries of the interests of public order, but at the same time throwing upon you, as legislators, a part, a great part of the responsibility of that determination—we propose to you to declare—that the peerage has ceased to be hereditary." In order, at the same time, that the new law, instead of taking the place of a fundamental and unchangeable article of the constitution, might be kept open for future alteration, if public opinion should become more favourable to the hereditary principle, the bill contained a clause enacting that its provisions might be afterwards modified, no proposition, however, to that effect



being submitted for examination to one legislature, unless the preceding should have entertained and remitted it for that purpose.

In the committee to which the bill was referred, five out of its nine members were in favour of the abolition of the hereditary quality of the peerage; four were opposed to it, including M. Beranger the reporter of the committee, who stated at great length, in his report, the reasons for holding that a chamber of peers, that had ceased to be hereditary could not fulfil the great political object of its creation—the furnishing of a permanent moderating and restraining power. The committee proposed some alterations in other parts of the bill. The ministerial bill left to the crown the unrestrained power of nomination; but the committee recommended that this power should be limited to particular classes of persons—categories as they were called—which were enumerated in the report, and comprehended all the grades of society, from which, in any circumstances, peers were likely to be selected, coupled, however, with conditions regarding length of service or amount of fortune.\*

---

\* The clause suggested by the committee was the following;—

“None can be called to the dignity of peer except—

“The presidents of the Chamber of Deputies and other legislative bodies; deputies, after three elections, or six years of service; marshals and admirals of France; lieutenant-generals and vice-admirals of the armies, by sea and land; Ministers, having a department; ambassadors, after three years of service; counsellors of state, after ten years of ordinary service; prefects of the departments, and maritime prefects, after ten years’ service; colonial governors, after five years’ service; members of the elective councils general, after three re-elections to the presidency; mayors of towns of 30,000 souls and upwards,

The committee likewise recommended that the measure should be final; and that, therefore, the clause declaring it to be capable of future modification, guarded as it was, should be omitted.

The chamber itself was much less equally divided on the hereditary principle than its committee had been. The proposed change was vehemently and ably opposed by M. Beranger, Royer Collard, Thiers, Guizot, and Berryer. Ministers themselves said nothing in its favour, except that the major part of the elections had imposed as a condition that it should be carried; “the legislature, in fact, has nothing to do, but to fulfil.” The clause abolishing the hereditary peerage was carried by a majority of 324 against 86. A very limited recognition of the principle implied in an amendment of M. Teste, who moved, that the eldest sons of peers should be admitted to succeed to their father’s seat, on obtaining the approval of the electoral college of the department in which they were assessed at the highest amount of direct taxes,

---

taken from the elective municipal councils, after five years of service; president of the court of cassation and court of accounts; the procureurs-general before these two courts, after five years’ service in that character; counsellors of the court of cassation, and counsellor-masters of the court of accounts, after five years’ service; the first presidents of the royal courts, after five years of magistracy in these courts; the procureurs-general before the said courts, after ten years of service; the members of the four academies or the institute; citizens, to whom by a law, and on account of eminent services, a national reward shall have been specially awarded; proprietors, heads of manufactories and commercial or banking-houses, paying 5,000 francs of direct contributions for their patents during five years.



was supported by a still smaller number.

The party, however, to whose power the hereditary principle had been sacrificed, were far from considering this concession sufficient. They made innumerable attempts against the provisions that the peerage once conferred should endure for life, and should be conferred by the king, striving to limit its duration to a fixed period, and to make the nomination depend, in some degree or other, on popular election. One amendment was moved, that the chamber of peers should consist of 200 members, elected for fifteen years, in certain proportions, by various electoral colleges, consisting respectively of deputies, members of general councils of departments, and the judges of the various courts, the members of the Institute, and some other scientific bodies, and superior officers of the army and navy. Another member proposed, that the electors of the peerage should be all persons paying 500 francs (20*l.*) in direct taxes; a third, that they should be chosen by the ordinary electoral colleges, but the payment of 1,500 francs direct taxes should be a condition of eligibility; a fourth, that the number should be 240, to be nominated for life, but by departmental colleges composed of electors paying 400 francs of direct taxes; a fifth, that one-half of the peerage should be elective, leaving to the king the nomination of the other half; and a sixth proposed, that not only should the future peerage be elective, but that the existing Chamber should be compelled to submit to the same ordeal. All these propositions, founded on the principle of election, or of temporary dura-

tion, or of both, things utterly inconsistent with the only rational purposes of a peerage, were either not seconded, or were rejected by large majorities. All attempts to introduce direct election having thus failed, the opposition combined its whole strength to limit the prerogative by confining its exercise to lists of candidates to be presented by different municipal or electoral bodies. This proposition was defeated by a majority of 58. The categories, however, which had been proposed by the committee, were adopted, and the opposition succeeded in engrafting on one part of them, the indirect exercise of popular nomination. The list of eligible classes, as settled by the committee, contained all proprietors paying 5,000 francs of direct taxes. This sum was reduced to 3,000 francs. Then an amendment was moved requiring as a condition, that such proprietor should have been for six years a member of a municipal or departmental council. These councils had hitherto been filled up by royal nomination; in future they were to be constituted by popular election, and thus the effect of the amendment, in so far as proprietors were concerned, was to give indirectly to the electors of the municipal and departmental councils the power of nominating the candidates for the peerage. A more important consequence of the amendment, and the principal object of its promoters was, to prevent the son of a peer from being named to his father's dignity immediately on his father's death, in consequence of his merely possessing the requisite amount of fortune. The amendment, though resisted by ministers more vigorously than even the original pro-



position of the committee, was carried against them by a majority of nine votes. The categories contained no class of churchmen. M. Meynard moved that archbishops, bishops, and the heads of protestant consistories, should be admissible to the peerage. The proposition was received with laughter, and cries of "The rabbis, too, the rabbis,"—certainly the only reception it could expect from an assembly which had already declared that Judaism and its teachers were as much entitled to the countenance of the state, and the support of the public purse, as Christianity and its pastors. On the other hand it was proposed to exclude from the capability of becoming peers, all who had ever borne arms against France; but the opposition could not agree about it among themselves, one section maintaining that such a provision would be inconsistent with that oblivion of the past which it was desirable to see adopted universally. M. de Tracy wished every ordinance creating a peer, to be a biographical sketch of his life, and moved that it should contain a detailed account of the services rendered by him, or of the other causes which may have determined the royal choice in his favour: which account, signed by all the members of the council, should be inserted in the *Moniteur* and the *Bulletin des Lois*. He considered the publicity attaching to a biographical sketch of a new peer as the best guarantee for the choice being carefully made; and he thought that, when services were sufficiently great to call for such a recompense, it could not be very difficult to particularize them. The proposition was rejected in this par-

ticular form, but a clause was inserted in the following words, "the ordinances naming the peers shall be individual, and shall indicate the services and titles on which the nomination shall be founded." Ministers endeavoured to get rid of the amendment of the committee which declared that the present measure should be a fundamental part of the constitution, unalterable by any subsequent law, and to restore to the Bill their own original clause which declared that its provisions might be modified by future legislatures. But the minority which supported them was very feeble, although the Chamber had agreed that the qualifications for the peerage should be liable to subsequent modifications. In truth, the matter was not of much importance, except as shewing the inconsistent spirit of men, who, living in change as their essential element, assumed the power of arrogating to themselves what they had denied to all their predecessors, and were now denying to all their successors. How did they persuade themselves that a legislature inclined to revise this matter, whether in a more popular or a less popular direction, would be bound up by a declaration like this; or that the charter of 1830 would be safer from the deputies of 1840, than that of 1815 had been from the deputies of 1830? A clause was likewise inserted, declaring that, "for the future, no pension, salary, or donation, can be attached to the dignity of a peer." In this shape the bill passed the Chambers by a majority of 386 votes against 40.

The proposition to subject even the existing Chamber to a new organization had not been enter-



tained, though made more than once ; but it was not apprehended that the peers would dare to refuse any one thing demanded by the deputies. M. Bignon had proposed a clause declaring that the bill, when accepted by the king, should become part of the constitution, and this, as he said, to prevent any collision with the peers ; while M. Mauguin declared such special provision to be unnecessary, as all constituent power was inherent in the chamber itself, and could not be affected even by the rejection of such a clause. This just meant, that whatever the Chamber, in the exercise of this "constitutional power," chose to declare to be law, forthwith became law, whether the king and peers chose to approve or to reject it. Before, however, the bill was carried up to the House of Peers, it was sufficiently ascertained that there would be a majority against the abolition of the hereditary principle, and it appeared from the sentiments expressed by the leaders of the majority, that they were not inclined to shrink from any of the consequences to which their maintenance of what they reckoned due to the constitution of the country might expose them. In the state of things which had existed in France for more than twelve months, the result probably would have been a new exercise of the despotism of Parisian tumults, and a resolution of the deputies to exclude the peers for exercising their constitutional rights, in the same way as they had, without the peers, excluded the fallen dynasty for usurping powers which the constitution denied to it. The minister, who had himself yielded to necessity in proposing the bill, and acceding

to the changes made upon it, could not be expected to allow the peers to challenge that necessity, while he possessed the means of controlling them. M. Perrier resolved to create as many peers as might be found necessary to carry through the bill. The intimation that such a proceeding was intended, brought down upon the government a storm of indignation, not from the enemies of the bill, whose power of resistance was thus to be neutralized, but from the liberals and radicals, whose only complaint was, that the bill did not go far enough. The ostensible ground, on which they found fault with the creation of peers, was, that it was an exercise of illegal power ; as the article of the former charter which gave the king the right of creation, must be held to have been suspended since the revolution of 1830, by the mere fact that it was then declared to be reserved as the subject of consideration and revision in the present session. But it was difficult to conceive of even party-spirit shutting its eyes to so plain an inference as that every thing, in which change had been delayed, remained unchanged, or to the notorious fact that the present king, since the revolution, and in virtue of this very article, had conferred peerages unquestioned on Marshal Soult and Admiral Duperrey. The true reason of the clamour now raised seemed to be in this, that the opposition would rather have witnessed the exercise of despotic popular authority, which would have been a further advance in the theory and practice of "movement," than the use of a remedy which would render unnecessary the application of their specific. In the Chamber



of Deputies they moved an address to the crown against the nomination of the new peers, but it was rejected by a large majority. The peers submitted to the multiplication of their members in silence.

The number of new peers was thirty-six, and yet it happened, that the committee of fourteen appointed to examine the bill, was equally divided, and delivered no opinion, on the most important part of the measure. Seven of them were for the abolition of the hereditary peerage, and seven against it. Even the former supported the proposition, not as a measure of legislative wisdom, or a political improvement, but as a dangerous, or, at least, a questionable change, demanded by a popular prejudice to which they were compelled to yield. The only alteration proposed by them on the other clauses of the bill was, to omit, in regard to proprietors paying 3,000 francs of taxes, the condition that they should likewise have been, for six years, members of a general council or of a chamber of commerce. The doubts, however, and the proposed alteration of the committee, vanished before the presence of the new peers in the house. The discussion in favour of the bill was left almost entirely to ministers, who took their stand on the same ground as before—we do not approve of it, but we cannot help it; while their opponents accused them of not having even the merit of making an useful sacrifice, for, in sacrificing the hereditary principle, nothing remained of any political value. “The peerage,” said Baron Mounier, “in spite of this law, will still be hereditary, because the principle of hereditary descent is accordant with the man-

ners of the country. There will be an hereditary succession *in fact* in place of an hereditary succession of right; but, being an object of suspicion for complaisance and servility, it will possess no power to interfere with effect between the popular body and the throne.” The bill was carried by a majority of thirty-six, exactly the number of new peers that had been created.

The course of the grave discussions on this great change in the political institutions of France had been interrupted by the ordinary episode of two or three days rioting in the streets, and two or three days violent debate and vague declamation in the Chamber, in honour of Poland. The intelligence of the triumph of Russia, and the surrender of Warsaw, was known in Paris on the 16th of September. Mobs were immediately got up, to express their sorrow and indignation at the failure of the Polish insurrection, by indulging in a little noise and insurrection of their own. Crowds hastened to the Palais Royal, decorated with crape, as an emblem of their grief—shouted Poland for ever, down with the ministry, death to the Russians—broke some windows in the residence of the minister for foreign affairs, and plundered a jeweller’s shop. The same scenes were repeated, by increased crowds, on the following day. An attempt was made to form a barricade at the entrance of the faubourg Montmartre: for this purpose, several trees were rooted up on the boulevards; the performances at some of the theatres were interrupted, and the shops began to be shut up, two gunsmiths having been already plundered. The military and national guards had



been called out, without being able to repress these exhibitions. On account of the dangers apprehended from the idleness of Sunday, the 18th, their numbers were increased, and directed to act with decision. The mobs assembled as usual, with all manner of seditious and savage cries, in the garden and court of the Palais Royal. They were speedily dispersed by the military, though not without resistance, but the inexplicable thing remained, why they had been allowed to congregate. It was necessary to disperse them more than once in the course of the day ; but tranquillity was restored by next morning, without any bloodshed, or any very serious injury to property. In the Chambers ministers were again exposed to the furious reproaches of the war-party, for having allowed Poland to perish, while not one of these declaimers pointed out how it could have been saved except by a general war ; and France was told that she must now prepare for invasion—that her foremost bulwark had been broken down, and the victorious Russians would forthwith be marching westward to overturn the revolution of July.

Alarms, too, still continued to be propagated of the formation of Carlist conspiracies, in the departments of the south and west. In particular, a petition was presented from La Vendee, invoking the interference of the Chamber to urge the government to take effectual measures for dispersing the armed bands of disaffected persons which infested several departments of the west. According to the statements of the petitioners, and of the members for La Vendee, the conscripts refused to join the

army, and formed themselves into bands to disturb the public peace. Though they could not commence a civil war, or oppose a regular army in the field, they were strong enough, it was alleged, to render civil tranquillity impossible, to attack in detail separate detachments of the king's forces, and to scour the country in open day, frightening their political antagonists into the towns from their residences in the country, and defying the efforts of the civil authorities, though backed with an army of forty thousand men, to repress their growing insolences. Mayors, it was added, and many other functionaries, were resigning their offices, partly from fear, partly from disgust at not being, as they supposed, duly supported by the government. Government, again, maintained that these representations were at least greatly exaggerated ; that if there were sources of disturbance, the government would be found strong enough to cut them off, but it did not think that any extraordinary powers were necessary for that purpose.

A bill, however, was passed, banishing from France for ever, all the members of the elder branch of the Bourbons, and their descendants. Although disapproved of by the minister, it was carried by a very large majority, with this alteration, that the penalty of death which the bill attached to a violation of the prohibition against entering the kingdom, was omitted. The same bill, by its second clause, denounced the same sentence of perpetual exclusion against all the family of Napoleon. Yet the Chamber had just been doing honour to that very Napoleon, whose relations it would no longer allow to pollute the French soil. A pe-



tion had been presented to the Chamber, praying that the remains of Bonaparte should be claimed from Britain, for the purpose of being deposited under the pillar on the Place Vendome. The committee on petitions disapproved of the proposal; and recommended that it should be gently set aside by the order of the day; but the Chamber, almost by acclamation, voted that it should be sent to the Council of Ministers; thus leaving to them to determine on the expediency of making the application to the British government. In the same spirit, a petition from certain inhabitants of the department of the Moselle, praying that a monument should be erected to the memory of marshal Ney at the public expence, was referred to the consideration of the government, without any opposition from the ministry, and accompanied by unbounded abuse of the allies, and, above all, of the duke of Wellington. General Lamarque proposed, as the inscription of the intended monument, "To Ney, judicially assassinated while his enemies commanded in Paris." Was there no one to tell these men, that such a monument would commemorate only the shame of the country which erected it? that Ney had been tried and condemned by a certain chamber of peers — and that, even if it were true, that a numerous assemblage of men of high station had been found, with so little conscience as to shed blood unjustly at the command of mere power, that assemblage had been an assemblage of French noblemen?

The crowds that produced the ever-recurring riots which so frequently disturbed the peace of Paris during the year were prin-

cipally furnished from the multitudes of unemployed men, whom the unsteadiness of all relations consequent on the revolution had deprived of the means of support. Credit, trade, and manufactures had all equally suffered. These very riots again, by increasing the feeling of insecurity, augmented the mischief. During the autumn, the Chamber of Deputies voted eighteen millions of francs, to be applied to the relief of the manufacturers, and in providing employment for the people. In asking this grant, the Minister of Commerce stated, that the existing distress arose, in a great measure, from the riots so frequent in the capital. But it existed likewise in the provinces; and, at Lyons, it led to disturbances infinitely more serious than those which had molested Paris. After the revolution, the manufacturers of Lyons had found it necessary to reduce the wages of their workmen. The latter determined to oppose this reduction by combinations. They agreed upon a tariff of their own, fixing the prices which should be paid for the various descriptions of work, and demanded, that it should be sanctioned and enforced by the civic authorities. The prefect granted their demand, and gave his ministerial approbation of the tariff, by which the manufacturers were to pay wages about one-third higher than the existing rate. The new tariff was to come into operation on the 1st of November, but when that day arrived, the manufacturers refused to give out work at the increased prices. The prefect authorized a meeting which they convoked at the Hotel de Ville. A deputation of the Chamber of Commerce and of the manufacturers attended, and, as



they declared their inability to pay the prices demanded, the meeting separated without any agreement. The mayor immediately called a meeting of the weavers alone, inviting them to name other delegates; but the difference was irreconcilable. Thousands of workmen being consequently thrown out of employment, they resolved to imitate the three glorious days of Paris, and to repel, by force, this encroachment on their tariff. Early in the morning of the 21st of November, the whole working population of the Croix Rousse, a suburb of Lyons, rose in open rebellion, many of them bearing the arms, and wearing the uniform of the National Guard. They secured their own position with barricades, and prepared to make themselves masters of the city. The garrison, and some battalions of the National Guards, consisting of the better classes, were led against them. The commander of the troops, and the prefect, having advanced to remonstrate with them, were seized and made prisoners. The second in command, general Roguet, then ordered the troops to attack. A brisk firing was kept up on both sides; but the rioters, notwithstanding the reinforcements which had been sent against them, retained their position till night. By breaking open the armourers' shops within their reach, they were now very generally armed; and, next morning, the contest recommenced. The rioters were now aided by a large body of their fellow workmen, who had risen, during the night, in another populous suburb beyond the Loire, had taken possession of all the bridges, and opened their fire on different parts of the city. The

efforts of the troops being thus divided, the original army of insurgents gained ground, and made good, before night, a partial entrance into the city. On the morning of the 23rd, with increased numbers and vigour, they attacked the Hotel de Ville, and the powder magazine. Houses began to be set on fire; furniture and the contents of warehouses to be destroyed; shops and cellars to be plundered; and the fury of intoxication to be added to the tumult. The Hotel de Ville and the magazine were carried. Successful resistance by the military became impossible; to continue it was only insuring wider havoc. On the evening of the 23rd, the troops, and those of the national guards who had remained faithful, withdrew from the city, and the rioters were left in triumphant possession of the second city of the kingdom, just as, the year before, a similar mob had made itself master of the capital. This intelligence being communicated in a proclamation by the civic authorities who remained, the fury of the rioters subsided. Another proclamation invited their leaders to join the magistrates in taking such measures as might prevent farther plunder. The insurgents immediately organized a civic guard; issued severe denunciations against pillage, and placed sentinels at the spots where disturbance might be apprehended. Although the dépôts of some silk-merchants were plundered and destroyed, outrages were successfully restrained within much narrower limits than could have been expected after the triumph of lawless and armed violence. The loss of life was much more severe. The number of those who had fallen, on both sides, was



variously estimated at from 600 to 800 men.

These events, when they were known at Paris, excited great alarm, in consequence of its being at first believed, that they were the result of political machinations. The duke of Orleans was immediately dispatched to Lyons, accompanied by the war-minister himself, marshal Soult, who was invested with extraordinary powers for quelling the revolt. A large body of troops were ordered to march upon the city; the national guards of the neighbouring departments were called out; and a force was collected, in the course of two or three days, which rendered continued resistance unavailing, though it might have been destructive. The insurgents, however, had given up all thoughts of resistance. The disturbance had been merely local; the neighbouring districts and towns remained tranquil. The leaders of the revolted silk-weavers issued proclamations, disclaiming all connection with "political or seditious insinuations," and declaring themselves to be "entirely devoted to Louis Philippe, king of the French, and to the constitutional charter."

The authority of the magistrates had never been suspended in point of form, though the real power was in the hands of the insurgents. When the duke of Orleans and marshal Soult approached with their army, they demanded unconditional submission; and, instead of at once attacking the city, they lingered, for a few days, in the neighbourhood, receiving deputations and issuing proclamations, knowing well that now, when all was ready for acting with vigour, delay would only shew the rioters more clearly the hopelessness of their situation. The latter accordingly very soon abandoned all attempts at negotiation. The duke and the marshal entered Lyons on the 3rd of December at the head of 26,000 men. The tariff was abolished. The national guard of Lyons, and the adjacent communes, was disbanded, and its men were ordered forthwith to return to the arsenal the arms of every kind which had been entrusted to them in their military capacity. These measures were carried into execution without opposition, and a numerous garrison remained to ensure the tranquillity of the city



## CHAP. XII.

**HOLLAND AND BELGIUM.**—*Candidates for the Belgic Crown—France declares that it will not recognize the Duke of Leuchtenberg—The Duke of Nemours is chosen—Decision of the Five Powers in regard to the Sovereign of Belgium—The Duke of Nemours refuses the Crown—The Belgians elect a Regent—Proceedings of the Conference—Disputes regarding the Scheldt—Warlike spirit of the Belgic Congress—The Conference lays down Bases of Separation—Belgium rejects and protests against them—Wavering Policy of France—Holland accepts of the Bases—Answer of the Conference to the Belgian Protest—The Conference declares the terms accepted by Holland to be “fundamental and irrevocable”—Belgium refuses them, demands War, and calls on Luxemburg to rise against the decision of the Five Powers—Anarchy throughout Belgium, and riots in the principal towns—Belgium is allowed till the 1st of June to accept of the Bases, under the pain of all relations between her and the Five Powers being broken off—The Conference endeavours to compass the election of Prince Leopold of Saxe Coburg, and promise their good offices with Holland in favour of Belgium, on the latter accepting the Bases—Belgium endeavours to negotiate directly with Holland, under a threat of renewing hostilities—Breach of the Armistice by the Belgians at Antwerp—Letter of Lord Ponsonby, on the part of the Conference to the Belgian Government—The Congress, without accepting the Bases, elects Prince Leopold King—Holland demands the execution of the fundamental and irrevocable Bases—The Conference again promises to enforce them, and order their Representatives to quit Brussels—Prince Leopold delays accepting the Crown—The Conference recedes from the irrevocable Bases, and proposes new terms at the expense of Holland—The Belgian Congress accepts them—Holland rejects them, and demands the performance of the existing Agreements—Prince Leopold accepts the Crown, and he is installed at Brussels with the concurrence of the Conference—Holland declares the Armistice at an end, and the Dutch army enters Belgium—Rout of the Belgians at Hasselt—Their army, commanded by the King, defeated at Louvain, and Louvain captured—A French Army arrives at Brussels, and the Dutch troops retire—Proceedings of the Conference in reference to the march of the Dutch and French armies—The French troops are recalled—Opening of the Session of the Belgic Chambers—The Conference frames another new set of Articles, and declares that their acceptance shall be compulsory—Belgium accepts them—Holland rejects them, but offers to negotiate—Negotiation refused—Treaty signed between the Five Powers, and the King of Belgium.*

**T**HE national Congress of revolted Belgium had occupied themselves, in the close of the preceding year, with fixing the constitution by which the new state was in future to be governed. Al-



though inclined of themselves to favour a republic, they had determined, in deference to the influence of the great Powers on whom they were dependent, that the form of their government should be monarchical, and they were now to be occupied with the choice of a sovereign. The variety of candidates proposed to the Congress by its own members, or in petitions, was amusing and embarrassing. A petition signed by forty persons proposed the prince of Orange; but it was not presented, because a law had already been passed excluding the whole family of Nassau from all power in Belgium. One of the members for Ostend having named his royal highness in the Chamber as a proper person to be elected, was visited with so much lofty indignation for having failed in the respect due to the house, that he resigned his seat. Petitions calling for a union with France were treated with much greater delicacy, although the provisions which declared Belgium to be an independent kingdom were just as solemn and irrevocable as those which had excluded the family of Orange. Some proposed a Neapolitan prince; others proposed Louis Philippe himself, king of the French; others, his son, the duke of Nemours; others, his minister for foreign affairs, Sebastiani; even Chateaubriand was named. Some called for a prince from Sweden; some for the prince of Savoy-Carignan; some for the pope; some for an Austrian archduke; many for prince Otho of Bavaria; but the favourite seemed to be the duke of Leuchtenberg, a son of Eugene Beauharnois, and, on his mother's side, a relation of the royal family of Bavaria.

The Congress, amid this variety

of objects, fell into the mistake of supposing that their freedom of election would be left untouched by the great Powers who had assumed the direction of all their most important affairs. The majority of voices would undoubtedly unite in favour of the duke of Leuchtenberg, and the Congress were foolish enough to suppose, that his relationship to Napoleon would be one great recommendation in the eyes of France, on whom they were more immediately dependent than on any other of the parties to the Conference of London. But, so soon as it was known at Paris, that the election was likely to terminate in favour of the duke, the French government intimated to the Belgian Commissioners, that France would not acknowledge him as a sovereign. The foreign minister informed them, according to the report which their diplomatic agents made to the Congress, that such a choice would be an injurious and even fatal combination for the Belgians. France would never recognize him as chief of that country; and the English cabinet would also refuse to recognize him. The king of France would not give his daughter to the son of a Beauharnois, and his government, instead of entering into the closest possible communication with Belgium, would be obliged to surround itself with barriers, and to alienate itself.

“The king, more than any body, desires that Belgium may be free, happy, and independent. He will readily assent to every thing that may contribute to its prosperity. He would with pleasure have seen the election of prince Otho; he would not hesitate to give him his daughter, as soon as the constitutional education of the



prince should be completed. The King does not understand what reason the Congress could have, to give the preference to the duke de Leuchtenberg. The prudent members of the Congress, who are the great majority, will understand the reasons of the French government for desiring that no prince of the family of Napoleon should reign at its doors. These reasons are too evident to make it necessary to detail them; what, however, is very certain, and irrevocably decided, is, that France will never recognize the duke de Leuchtenberg as king of the Belgians; and, above all, that king Philippe will never give him one of his daughters for his consort. Of all possible combinations Louis Philippe does not hesitate to declare, that to propose the young duke of Leuchtenberg for the king of Belgium would be the most disagreeable to France, and the least favourable to the tranquillity and independence of the Belgians.' "

The French diplomatists were highly offended at the want of delicacy and knowledge of business, which at once communicated to the Congress, and thereby to all Europe, verbal communications, only the general results of which required, or were fitted, to be so publicly proclaimed; but the fact remained certain, that France would not acknowledge the duke of Leuchtenberg as king of Belgium. The Congress complained loudly that this was intervention with their national affairs, and a tyrannical encroachment upon their rights as an independent state, forgetting altogether that they had no national affairs, and no independence, except in so far as France and her allies might be pleased to secure them. They

would not even retract from the nomination of the duke of Leuchtenberg, notwithstanding this explicit declaration of the French government. On the contrary, M. Lebeau moved, on the 19th of January, that the duke should be forthwith requested to accept the vacant, or rather the intended throne, and the proposition was referred, amid loud applauses, to the sections of the Congress. Less violent men, however, saw, that to persist in electing a denounced candidate, would only involve Belgium in a hopeless contest with her high protectors. They now proposed the duke of Nemours, the second son of the king of the French. They thought that this selection would flatter the French government, and they were sure that, as a measure of French aggrandizement, it would be favoured by the French people, and the most active and noisy portion of the French Chambers. But the advantageous nature of this nomination for France was the very circumstance which could not fail to render it ineffectual. On the one hand, France favoured every thing which could perpetuate the separation of Belgium from Holland, because that separation increased infinitely her prospects of adding Belgium to her own dominions: she, therefore, threatened war, if any attempt were made by foreign Powers to restore the broken union—an attempt which, but for this consideration, Prussia and Austria would probably have made. On the other hand, the great European Powers, although, to avoid war, they consented to the separation, would not consent that Belgium should become part of France either in form or in effect. France sacrificed, in the mean time, at least, her desire of ex-



tended territory; the other Powers had sacrificed their desire of maintaining the kingdom of the united Netherlands. France would not allow Russia, Prussia, or Austria, to interpose, because that would be an intervention in the affairs of a foreign state; but all the Powers, while proclaiming the principle of non-intervention, immediately set it at defiance, by not only compelling Holland to follow their own policy towards her revolted provinces, but by compelling these provinces themselves to submit to such arrangements, and to select such governors, as the contradictory interests of the allies might allow. The election of the duke of Leuchtenberg would have been an obnoxious proceeding towards France, and the other Powers had refused to give it any countenance. The election of the duke of Nemours would have been almost the completion of the policy dictated by the hardly restrained ambition of France; and just for that reason, it could not be permitted by the other Powers, with whom France could not come to a rupture on such grounds, without proclaiming projects which would have justified, and probably would have roused, an European warfare against her aggressions. When, therefore, the Belgian agents sounded the French government on the proposed election of the king's son, they were plainly told that the choice would be useless, for the proffered crown would not be accepted. "I have been directed," said Sebastiani to them, on the 21st of January, "to inform you in a clear and distinct manner, of the intentions of the king's government. He cannot consent to the re-union of Belgium to France. He will not

accept the crown for the duke of Nemours, even were it offered to him by the Congress. His majesty's government is of opinion that the choice of the duke of Leuchtenberg would be likely to interrupt the tranquillity of France. We have not the slightest idea of restricting the liberty of the Belgians in their choice of a sovereign, but we shall exercise our right in declaring, in the strongest manner, that we shall not recognize the election of the duke of Leuchtenberg. No doubt the other Powers will not be very favourable to that choice; for our part, we are only influenced in this refusal by state reasons, to which every other consideration ought to yield, when it does not interfere with the rights of any individual."

This first interference with their supposed independence renewed the indignation of the Belgic Congress. They exclaimed that this refusal to recognize any king whom they might choose, was neither more nor less than an intervention, a direct avowal by the French government, that they disowned the principle of the free election of a sovereign—that France had a secret object, which she was afraid to express openly—that she wished to conquer the Belgians, and lead them, through the ordeal of anarchy, to the yoke she was preparing for them. Others insisted that this intervention was part of a plot to bring back the House of Orange. Others declared that the determination of the French government was not that of the French people, and a few weeks would probably overturn the former, and give full room to the wishes of the latter. All seemed to agree that they ought



to proceed to their election without consideration of refusals or resolutions.

The day of election had already been fixed for the 28th of January ; and, though the discussion began upon that day, it was interrupted by so many incidental digressions, that it did not close till the 3rd of February. The two candidates, between whom the Congress seemed to be divided, were precisely the duke of Leuchtenberg and the duke of Nemours. The Belgians seemed to have made this selection for the very purpose of shewing how completely they could exclude every possibility of acting like sensible men. During the discussion, a note from the French minister for foreign affairs to the representative of his court at Brussels was publicly read, directing him to inform the provisional government, that the French ministry would regard the election of the duke of Leuchtenberg "as an act of hostility towards, France," and ordering him, if the duke was elected in defiance of this declaration, immediately to quit Brussels. To this communication, likewise, the duke's party paid no regard, but increased their taunts and reproaches against those members, who, having originally been friendly to their candidate, had abandoned him, because he was disapproved of by a foreign court, to support the duke of Nemours ; and certainly the men who had done so had not bettered their claims to prudent or intelligible conduct, for, if the duke whom they had forsaken was not to be recognized by France, the duke to whom they now adhered, would not, as they were expressly told, be allowed even to accept the crown which they might offer.

If the Congress had contained any number of men wise enough to see, and modest and frank enough to declare, the true relation in which Belgium stood to the other powers of Europe, and the relation in which she would speedily again stand even to Holland, if their restraining power was withdrawn, they might have saved that assembly from the ridicule of determining to do one of two things, neither of which, they had been informed in very plain language, they would be permitted to do. All the speakers agreed that the choice between these two candidates was merely a choice of difficulties ; but not one of them gave an intelligible reason why they should voluntarily entangle themselves in these difficulties, or why, after what had passed, both these candidates should not be omitted. If they meant to show their independence by electing a king without regard to the wishes of foreign Powers, they ought to have been prepared to maintain that election. If they thought that they could maintain it, they betrayed egregious vanity, and immeasurable ignorance of their own situation. If they were prepared to depart from it as soon as made, and wished to make an useless election, knowing it would be useless, merely to shew that they would vote as they pleased, they manifested only puerile silliness. The supporters of the duke of Leuchtenberg maintained, that, if his rival were elected, war was unavoidable, while his success would render it only possible, but perhaps not even probable. It was not likely that the French nation, which, not many months before, had chosen their own sovereign, when other powers would willingly have prevented a change, would



allow war to be made on the Belgians for merely following their example. Nemours was France, in the eyes of the four great Powers, and his election would be only another form of an union with France. That union Europe would not permit : England would never allow the Scheldt to belong to her enemy, nor would the continental nations tamely submit to see the boundaries of France once more advanced to the Rhine. If Belgium was given to her royal family she would assuredly attempt to regain these limits, and from that instant a coalition would be formed against her. Her defeat, or her triumph, in such a war would be equally fatal to Belgium. If she were triumphant, adieu to independence ; if she were defeated, hail to the House of Orange, brought back under the shadow of foreign bayonets. The election of the French prince, moreover, would necessitate a continuance of that provisional system, consisting in an administration without unity or method, and a government without force, which had already produced so many evil consequences. Even if the French ministry should be willing to depart from the positive refusal which they had already given, months would probably elapse before a decisive answer was obtained. In the mean time Holland would intrigue ; civil war would devastate the country ; and its industry would wither under a foreign war, when the European powers had discovered that France had falsified her assurances, and that all her protestations of disinterestedness had been assumed only to conceal schemes of unjust ambition. On the other hand, the election of the duke of Leuchtenberg might be a source of irrita-

tion to France, but not a cause of war, and it would give to the other great Powers an interest different from that of their too powerful neighbour. In truth, France did not wish to see a prince on the throne who might teach Belgium to look forward to future power and prosperity free from French protection ; she wished to keep Belgium weak in all its relations, in order that it might the more easily become her own.

The partisans of the French prince, again, maintained that it would be a great advantage to Belgium to have the support of a nation with 30,000,000 of population, which would be obtained by making alliance with the French people, through the election of the duke of Nemours. The choice of the duke of Leuchtenberg would put Belgium in a state of hostility with the French, the Poles, and the Greeks—he would, at length, fall himself, and give place to the prince of Orange. There was every reason to believe that, if he became king of Belgium, he would not be recognized by the great Powers, and then what would happen ? The armistice between Belgium and Holland depended upon a convention concluded between the five great Powers. France would repudiate the contract and retire ; Holland would recommence the contest against the Belgians without any one interfering, and they would be overcome by the closing of the Scheldt, and by their intestine divisions, whilst the Powers of the North would either replace Belgium under the domination of the House of Orange, or partition it. The fate of Belgium must be linked with that of France ; but by choosing the duke of Leuchtenberg,



recollections of the empire and of Buonapartism would be recalled; France would see in it a Napoleon restoration, and, in Belgium, the centre of all the intrigues and bad passions of the partisans of the imperial dynasty. The first object of Belgium should be to attach France, whose good will was of far more importance to her commerce than that of the other Powers, even if the latter were supposed willing to concur in an election against which France protested. But that concurrence was not to be expected; and, in that event, the new king would be isolated, without connection, without influence, without resources.

At last they came to the vote. The number of members present was 191. Of these 89 voted for the duke of Nemours, 67 for the duke of Leuchtenberg, and 35 for the archduke Charles. As none of the candidates had thus an absolute majority, it was necessary to vote again. On this second occasion 192 members were present, the absolute majority of which was 97. The result of the scrutiny gave 97 votes for the duke of Nemours, 74 for the duke of Leuchtenberg, and 21 for the Austrian Archduke. The first, having thus the absolute majority, and not a single vote more, the president announced that Louis Charles Philippe of Orleans, duke of Nemours, was now king of the Belgians, and would be duly received, on taking an oath, "to observe the constitution and laws of the Belgian people, and maintain the national independence and the integrity of the territory." A deputation of ten members was appointed to proceed to Paris to inform his majesty of his promotion.

The obstinacy of this legislative body in persevering to elect a prince whom France had pledged herself to all Europe to refuse to them, might have excited suspicions regarding the good faith of the French ministry. Nay, during the discussion, a M. Van de Weyer, who was a member of the diplomatic committee, and had been one of the agents of the new government at London, declared, that he knew the duke of Nemours, if elected, would accept the crown, and that he had just received official notice of the revocation of the refusal formerly given. The thing was false—but the diplomatists of Belgium conducted themselves, in their communications to Congress, precisely like the editor of a gossiping newspaper. The Conference of London had decided the matter in the month of January by a protocol which bore, that the five Powers, without deciding any thing relative to the sovereignty of Belgium, declare, that, in their eyes, the sovereign of that country must suffice, by his personal position, for the safety of the neighbouring states, must accept the fundamental bases agreed on by the Conference, and be placed in a situation to assure the peaceable enjoyment of them to the Belgians. The election having taken place, another protocol was signed, on the 7th of February, bearing the declaration of the French plenipotentiary that his court, in conformity with the principles already established by the Conference, had determined to reject the throne now offered to the duke of Nemours. As it was likely that the abused Congress would now fall back on the duke of Leuchtenberg, the same document, in return for the fidelity of France, declared, that



if the sovereignty of Belgium should be offered to that prince, and if he accepted it, none of the five great Powers would recognize him. The Congress treated these resolutions as being, not acts of mediation, but direct and tyrannical interventions—and perhaps they were right: but it was difficult to sympathize with men who were daily exhibiting only ignorant impertinence. Their diplomatic committee answered to this communication, that it regarded a matter on which they could receive no information from the Conference at London, and that they awaited the return of their own deputation from London. As if this had not been enough, they added, “One of our agents at Paris has written to us, that we ought to receive with great distrust all papers which speak of the refusal of the duke de Nemours!” And this in the face of an official communication by the plenipotentiaries of France, Britain, Austria, Russia, and Prussia, that the refusal of his royal highness was already fixed and final.

The deputation, which had been received at Paris with great civility, was admitted to the royal presence on the 17th of February, and received from his majesty’s own mouth the assurance which their stupid diplomatists had refused to take from the ambassadors, including his own. He expressed in very polite terms, his good wishes for the independence and prosperity of Belgium, and the grateful sense which he entertained of the honour conferred upon his family by this vote of its Congress; but informed them that his regard for the peace of Europe, and the happiness of its nations, rendered it imperative that this honour should be declined. “It will never be the thirst

of conquest, or the honour of seeing a crown placed upon the head of my son, that will lead me to expose my country to the renewal of the evils which war brings in its train, and for which the advantages, which we might derive from it, however great they might otherwise be, cannot compensate. The examples of Louis XIV. and Napoleon, would suffice to preserve me from the fatal temptation of erecting thrones for my sons, and to make me prefer the happiness of having maintained peace to all the splendour of the victories, which, in case of war, French valour would not fail again to secure to our glorious standards.” The return of the deputation to Brussels having satisfied the Congress that the protocols of the Conference might be believed, and that of the 7th of February assuring them that the duke of Leuchtenberg would not be recognized, they determined to elect a regent, until they should learn to follow the suggestions of the great Powers—the point to which it had been plain from the beginning they must finally come.

The person selected to discharge the duties of Regent was a M. Surlet de Chokier, who had been a violent opponent of the former sovereign in the States General, and the head of the late deputation to Paris. He was installed on the 25th of February, and assumed, without any power to do good, the partial direction of the affairs of a country in which a regular government could scarcely be said to exist. The only shape in which authority appeared was that of extravagant speeches, and sounding decrees in the Congress. What was called a government was neither loved, respected, nor feared. The law had lost all force to pro-



fect either property or persons: every thing was at the mercy of the ebullitions of a dominant faction; and the commands of clubs were more powerful than a body of legislators which was utterly helpless except in so far as it followed the popular excitement of which it was the creature.

In the mean time the Conference of London, composed of the plenipotentiaries of Austria, Britain, France, Russia, and Prussia, was persevering in the task which it had imposed upon itself of finally arranging the terms of separation between Holland and Belgium. Having compelled both sides in the month of November, 1830, to consent to an armistice, or rather a suspension of arms, they put forth a protocol on the 20th December, declaring themselves ready to proceed to the final determination of all disputed matters, and requesting the provisional government at Brussels to send to London commissioners provided with full powers. The Dutch minister was already on the spot. The two most difficult points to arrange were the apportionment of the debt, and the territorial boundaries. In regard to the latter, Belgium insisted on receiving not only the province of Limburg, but the left bank of the Scheldt below Antwerp, and the whole grand duchy of Luxemburg, a constituent part of the Germanic Confederation, the sovereignty of which belonged to his Dutch Majesty, not as king of the Netherlands, but as grand duke of Luxemburg. The principal foundation of their claims seemed to be, that their emissaries had stirred up insurrection against the grand duke as well as against the king, and that the rebels of Luxemburg

had sent members to Congress. By the protocol of 20th December, the Conference claimed from the Belgic authorities the immediate and formal cessation of all interference in the affairs of the grand duchy, and required it to issue the necessary proclamations for communicating this resolution to the inhabitants. To the application desiring commissioners to be sent to London, the Belgian government answered, that its commissioners, who were already there, had sufficient instructions, adding, "they cannot conceal from the Conference that, in the critical circumstances in which the Belgian nation is placed, it will doubtless appear impossible for Belgium to form an independent state, without an immediate guarantee of the freedom of the Scheldt, of the possession of the left bank of that river, of the whole of the province of Limburg, and of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, reserving its relations with the Germanic Confederation."

The complaint regarding the Scheldt was founded on its being an alleged breach of the armistice, and a positive act of hostility, while Holland maintained that she could not justly be called on to open up to her enemy, during a mere suspension of arms, a passage through her own dominions, and a military line of defence. She was only exercising a right belonging to her as an independent state. Belgium, on the other hand, had not given up even active operations. The cessation of hostilities had been faithfully observed by the Dutch commanders, but the insurgents repeatedly infringed it both in north Brabant and in Zealand, and at last, in the beginning of January, advanced from



the lines to which the armistice confined them, and made an unsuccessful attack upon Maestricht. The Conference, by a protocol of the 9th January 1831, endeavoured to remove these mutual causes of complaint. They declared that they considered any measure which impeded the navigation of the Scheldt an act of hostility; that its free navigation must be restored without any other duties than such as had been payable by neutrals before the union; and that, if it was not placed on this footing in regard to the Belgians by the 20th January, the Conference would adopt means to compel a prompt execution of this provision. They ordered, likewise, that the Belgian troops, which had advanced towards Maestricht, should retire, by the 20th of January, within the position which they had occupied at the date of the armistice.

The Dutch government complied with the order thus issued, while protesting against its justice and the right of the Conference to issue it. "His majesty is aware," said Holland, "it would be inconsistent with his dignity to cause any remonstrance to be made to the Conference in London, on account of the parallel drawn between the manifest infraction of the suspension of hostilities by the insurgents, and the defensive measures of police and interior security, which he has been under the necessity of maintaining on the Scheldt. When applying for the good offices of his allies to reduce his rebellious subjects to their duty, and to remove the difficulties that had arisen, his majesty certainly could not foresee that the London Conference would have placed his lawful authority, guaranteed as it was by treaties, and

strengthened by the closest ties of friendship and good understanding, on the same footing with that of the usurped authority which has erected itself in Belgium. But, overlooking this assimilation of two matters of a nature so entirely different, the form and tenor of that part of the protocol in question, his majesty cannot express himself satisfied with. Unquestionably the Conference that gave birth to the protocol, was engaged in the consideration of a subject specially connected with the concerns of the kingdom of the Netherlands, and without the king's plenipotentiaries having had any direct participation therein, as they were entitled to by the 4th paragraph of the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle of November the 15th, 1818, in which the right was reserved. The reservation of this right at Aix-la-Chapelle was indeed unnecessary to establish the principle, that no meeting of plenipotentiaries, in whatever number they may assemble, and how powerful soever the states they represent may be, is qualified to regulate the particular and territorial concerns of other states. It was, no doubt, in accordance to the wishes of the king of the Netherlands, that the London Conference assembled, but the object was the restoration of legal order in a part of his dominions, and in no way to circumscribe his means of defence, or to make any inroad upon the independence of the old united provinces of the Netherlands. Neither the law of nations, the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle, nor the object for which the Conference was assembled, namely, the defence of the king's rights, gave authority to the Conference to discuss the question of the Scheldt. As to the principal point of that



question, the protocol of November the 4th says, that hostilities shall entirely cease on both sides. Now the government of the Netherlands, after having notified its adhesion to the said protocol, strictly complied with its stipulations; but a cessation of hostilities, the only effect of which is a suspension of aggressive measures, never deprives a power of the faculty of maintaining, on her own territory, her military lines of defence, and of preventing that territory being traversed by the enemy or neutrals; and no precedent is recorded in history of a distinction having ever been made in this respect between the roads that lead through or to such defences, and the rivers. It is an unjust assertion to say, that travellers or merchant vessels are molested, or that hostilities are committed against them, when they are hindered from passing through a fortress, or through a line of defence established on a river within the country. In short, the mention made of toll-duties, and a right of visitation in the protocol of January the 9th, 1831, substantiates the fact, that, in this matter, the domestic concerns of the kingdom of the Netherlands are affected. His majesty deems the said demand and declaration of the Conference derogatory to his sovereignty, and the independence of the old united provinces of the Netherlands, subversive of the law of nations, and in no way compatible with the sentiments of friendship which the five Courts have hitherto professed for his majesty. Nevertheless, the king, taking into consideration that Europe cannot expect, from the exertions of a single state, however glorious its annals, a return to the true system of non-intervention, founded

on the regard due to the rights of every people, has determined not to set himself in opposition to overwhelming power, but for the present to remain a spectator of the navigation of the Scheldt, from the 20th inst., by neutral or Belgian vessels, under the most formal reservation and protestation, with respect both to the said navigation itself, and to the duties which his majesty has the right to levy on the vessels that navigate that river."

In the Belgian Congress, again, where men were perfectly willing that Holland should be compelled to give up every thing, but that Belgium, as an independent nation, should be allowed to do whatever it might think proper, this order of the Conference was angrily denounced as a violation of right. They actually seemed to think that, if left to themselves, they could carry their point against Holland by force of arms, and were indignant that their imagined prowess should be restrained. M. Robaux proposed to the Congress to declare, that Belgium would not recognize any right in the five Powers to make themselves arbiters of its differences with Holland, especially if their determinations were to be executed by force—that the protocol of the 9th of January, in providing for compelling the belligerents to observe the armistice, laid down, in violation of the rights of nations, the principle of a direct and armed intervention—that, "if the governments league together at London to stifle the germs of liberty, wherever they appear, the holy alliance of nations will find means to break the fetters which despotism is preparing for them—and that Belgium, confiding in the sympathy



of nations for the Belgians, and the sacred cause which they defend, declares that the nation will rise *en masse* to preserve its rights and its independence." Notwithstanding these sounding words, the Congress knew well, that submission was unavoidable, and the answer of their diplomatic committee consented to the withdrawal of the troops from before Maestricht, adding, however, that Belgium admitted this interference only because it was a temporary measure, and would by no means allow of a similar interference in the permanent settlement of its relations. "Every convention," they said, "the effect of which would be to determine questions of territory or finance, or to affect the independence or any other absolute right of the Belgic nation, is essentially one of the attributes of the National Congress, and it alone has a right finally to decide. Accordingly, it is because the proposals of the Powers did not affect any of these rights or great interests, because they had for their object a situation merely temporary, and transitory as the nature itself of its attributes, that the Belgic government has been able to give its assent to them. The committee will add, the very serious consideration that any other interpretation of the spirit of the negotiations that have hitherto been carried on, and of their results, would really transform the friendly proceeding of the Powers into direct and positive intervention in the affairs of Belgium—an intervention, the principle of which the Congress has formally rejected, and which would appear to the committee no less incompatible with the general peace of Europe, than with the independence of the

nation." Thus Belgium formally declined the jurisdiction of the Conference on those two very points, the debt and the territory, on which the most irreconcilable differences had already arisen between the parties.

The Conference, however, had no intention of allowing the powers which it had assumed to be questioned by one of the parties towards whom they were to be exercised. On the 20th of January, they issued a protocol, containing "the fundamental bases" on which the treaty of separation was to be founded. It was agreed that Holland should comprise all the territories which had belonged to the United Provinces in 1790, while Belgium was to consist of the other territories which had been formed, in 1815, into the kingdom of the Netherlands, with the exception of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, "which," said the Conference, "being possessed by the princes of the house of Nassau under a different title, forms part, and will continue to form part, of the Germanic Confederation." As this demarcation of limits would give to each of the states portions of territory isolated in the territories of the other, the five Powers were to arrange such exchanges as would produce continuity of possession, and a free communication. The streams and rivers traversing the territories of the respective states were to be subject to the provisions of the general act of the Congress of Vienna relative to the free navigation of rivers. Lastly it was settled, that Belgium, thus defined, "shall form a state perpetually neutral, the five powers guaranteeing to it that perpetual neutrality, as well as the inviolability and integrity of its terri-



tory," a reciprocal obligation to observe this neutrality being laid upon Belgium itself. These territorial arrangements were followed, on the 27th of January, by another protocol which laid down the basis for the apportionment of the public debt. The Conference took for their guide the treaties of 1815, and the financial resources and contributions of Holland and Belgium, as ascertained by the budgets for three years preceding the rebellion. Of the common debt, Belgium was to pay  $\frac{1}{3}\frac{6}{1}$ , and Holland  $\frac{1}{3}\frac{5}{1}$ , the Belgians being to participate in the trade of the colonies, so long as these remained subject to Holland, but being bound to contribute towards their defence.

With these arrangements, however, and more especially with those which marked out its territory, Belgium would have nothing to do. Although they obtained the province of Liège, to which they could have laid no claim, they insisted that their independence was treated with disrespect, unless Holland were robbed in order to give them the whole of the left bank of the Scheldt, Limburg, and Luxemburg. The Congress resolved to protest against the protocol of the 20th of January, and a committee was appointed to draw up a sufficiently wise and energetic remonstrance. The election of the king, which had already begun, was interrupted for the purpose of hastening it, and the protest was agreed to on the 1st of February. There could be no doubt that the possession of Limburg, and the left bank of the Scheldt to the sea, would be a great advantage to newly-created Belgium: and in that view, perhaps, they should have been thanked for

demanding so little. The whole course of the Meuse, for instance, with Rotterdam, would have been highly beneficial to their commerce, and even Amsterdam would have done them no injury. Luxemburg, again, they claimed by what they termed the *jus postliminii*, "and the facts of their revolution," which latter meant, that they were entitled to the sovereignty of every part of the king of Holland's dominions in which they could incite the population to insurrection. The protest declared, in the name of the Belgic people, that the great Powers had proposed an armistice only to prevent the effusion of blood, without prejudice to what should be subsequently determined regarding the boundaries, but, by fixing the limits of Belgium, they had violated the principle of non-intervention: That negotiations on this subject belonged exclusively to the Congress, which therefore protested against any demarcation of the Belgian territory made without its participation, and that it would never submit to what would affect the integrity of the state.

The Belgians were encouraged for a time in their resistance by a circumstance which was calculated to excite great doubts regarding the designs of France, more especially as it occurred just when the majority of the Congress were persevering in electing for their king a French Prince. The plenipotentiary of France had signed the protocol of the 20th January along with the ministers of the other Powers; but, on the 1st of February, Sebastiani, the French foreign minister, wrote to the French agent at Brussels, requesting him, if that protocol had not yet been commu-



nicated to the Belgian government, to oppose its communication, "because the king's government has not yet assented to it. In the question of the debt, as well as of the limits of the Dutch and Belgian territory, we have always understood that the concurrence and consent of both states were necessary. The Congress at London is a mediation, and it is the intention of the king's government that it should never lose that character." This letter was immediately read in the Congress at Brussels, where it diffused a general, but short-lived joy. If the vacillating cabinet of M. Lafitte ever entertained the design of taking the part of Belgium, and separating from the other Powers, the firmness of these Powers triumphed over the temporary seduction. That there had been some danger of a schism was evident from the fact, that, on the accession of M. Perrier to power, the Congress demanded a special act of adhesion, on the part of France, to the bases laid down in the protocol of 20th of January, which France had thus questioned. The terms of this act bore, that "the plenipotentiary of France declared, by the express command of his sovereign, that France acceded to the protocol of 20th January; that she approved of the boundaries fixed by that act for Belgium; that she recognized the neutrality as well as inviolability of the Belgic territory; that she would acknowledge the sovereign of Belgium only when he should have acceded to all the conditions of that protocol, and that, according to the principles there laid down, the French government considered the grand duchy of Luxemburg as completely separated from Belgium to continue under

VOL. LXXIII.

the sovereignty and in the relations assigned to it by the treaty of 1815." The other plenipotentiaries expressed their high satisfaction with this assurance, regretting that there should have been even a momentary difference of opinion between them and France; and they declared that, "as the main principle of the five Powers is, to respect treaties, it is evident that the stipulations of treaties relative to the grand duchy of Luxemburg must be observed."

Even before, however, this formal ratification of the bases had been obtained, the Conference of London, including the plenipotentiary of France, had given an answer to the Belgian protest, in terms which, if they were not sufficiently bound already, rendered it impossible for them, with any regard to honour and justice, to draw back. Holland had given in her adhesion to the terms of the 20th of January, on the 18th of February. By a protocol bearing date the following day, the Conference pledged themselves anew to the execution of these articles, and fully exposed the folly and absurdity of the Belgian demands. The Belgian protest, they therein said, claimed a right of post-limits which belonged only to independent states, and which consequently could not belong to Belgium, as she had never been reckoned among these states. It founded likewise upon cessions made to third parties, not to Belgium, which had never been in possession of them, and could not found upon them. "Far from making any attack on the ancient provinces of Belgium, the Powers have only maintained and declared the integrity of neighbouring states. Instead of narrowing the limits of these pro-

[2 C]



vinces, they have included within them the principality of Liège which had never formed a part of them. Belgium has obtained all that she could require, separation from Holland, independence, external safety, guarantees of her territory and neutrality, the free navigation of the rivers for the use of her commerce, and peaceable enjoyment of her national liberties. Such are the arrangements opposed by a protest which publicly avows that it respects neither the possession nor the rights of adjoining states." The protocol having thus disposed of the demands of Belgium proceeded, in the following terms, to re-enact the bases already laid down, to which Holland had consented only on the faith that they were to be observed and enforced, and all the objections to which, urged on the part of Belgium, had been heard and considered. The Conference declared. "1. That it remains understood, as it has been from the beginning, that the arrangements resolved on by the protocol of January 20, 1831, are fundamental and irrevocable arrangements. 2. That the independence of Belgium shall be recognised by the five Powers only, upon the conditions and in the limits which result from the said arrangements of January 20, 1831. 3. That the principle of the neutrality and the inviolability of the Belgian territory in the above mentioned limits remains in vigour, and obligatory upon the five Powers. 4. That the five Powers, faithful to their engagements, claim the full right of declaring that the sovereign of Belgium must answer by his personal situation to the principle even of the existence of Belgium—satisfy the security of the other states—

accept without restriction, as his majesty the king of the Netherlands had accepted the protocol of July 21, 1814, all the fundamental arrangements contained in the protocol of January 20, 1831,—and have it in his power to secure to the Belgians the peaceable enjoyment thereof. 5. That these first conditions being fulfilled, the five Powers will continue to employ their care and their good offices to lead to the reciprocal adoption and execution of the other arrangements rendered necessary by the separation of Belgium from Holland. 6. That the five Powers admit the right in virtue of which the other states may take such measures as they may judge necessary to enforce respect to, or to re-establish, their legitimate authority in all the countries belonging to them, to which the protest mentioned above sets up pretensions, and which are situated out of the Belgian territory declared neutral. 7. That his majesty the king of the Netherlands having acceded without restriction, by the protocol of February 18, 1831, to the arrangements relative to the separation of Belgium from Holland, every enterprise of the Belgian authorities upon the territory which the protocol of January 20 has declared Dutch, will be regarded as a renewal of the struggle to which the five Powers have resolved to put an end." No engagement could be more binding and express. These articles were declared to be irrevocable, and the demands of Belgium to be inconsistent with the rights of neighbouring states; therefore they could not be abandoned without a breach of faith, and a perpetration of what the Conference itself had declared beforehand to be injus-



tice. Belgium might elect a king, but the five Powers pledged themselves never to acknowledge him, except on his adhesion to these specific articles, and it was impossible, therefore, to suspect that they would ever acknowledge a sovereign elected for the purpose of setting them at defiance. These engagements, too, were now engagements contracted towards Holland, which, on the faith of them, had left herself in their hands. Neither was there any want of power to enforce them; the idea of resistance by Belgium excited laughter every where, except in the Congress at Brussels. Or if the Conference should not wish to employ force, and, in defiance of every thing by which men could be pledged, should change these "irrevocable" bases in favour of Belgium, it could only be the most glaring partiality to use or threaten force to compel Holland to submit to an alteration.

The wrath of the revolutionary Congress of Belgium now knew no bounds; their language and their proposals were equally extravagant; they set Holland and the Congress at defiance; they clamoured for war with all Europe. On the 11th of March, the regent, who was the mere tool of the dominant faction, issued a proclamation to the inhabitants of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, calling upon them to throw off their government, and assuring them that Belgium would remain true to their cause. "Do not suffer yourselves to be seduced by promises, or terrified by threats. The Congress has protested against the acts of the Congress of London. The nation, which has been able to vanquish the Dutch armies, will maintain the protest of its representa-

tives. We began our revolution in spite of the treaties of 1815; we shall finish it in spite of the protocols of London." This was a declaration of war, not only against Holland, but against the allies. M. Robaulx, the true representative of the clubs and mobs who now governed, spoke thus in the Congress: "M. Sebastiani has said openly, that France accepts the protocol of the 20th of January, which deprives us of Luxemburg. Thus the candidate announced to us was only a lure. Louis Philippe has joined the holy alliance of despots: we must declare war, for we cannot suffer our territory to be violated. France abandons us: we are left to ourselves. Let us appeal to the nation, for it is a war of nations against despots. As a reward for what we have done to respect the tranquillity of Europe, it is attempted to tear Belgium to pieces, gold is lavished, riots are excited. Since kings declare war against us, let us declare war against kings. The constitution which we have all voted, considers Luxemburg as part of Belgium. The regent has sworn to maintain the integrity of the territory." Even the minister for foreign affairs declared that he considered war inevitable, for it was a point of honour to defend Luxemburg. A motion was made, and actually referred to the sections for consideration, in these terms: "The Belgian government declares to king William, that if he does not, within a month, renounce the possession of Limburg, Luxemburg, the left bank of the Scheldt, and the citadel of Antwerp, he shall be compelled by force of arms," and this at a time when they had not a regiment



which would have looked Dutch troops in the face, and neither money nor credit to support an army. The ministry allowed that the treasury was empty, and they knew not how to fill it. There was a large deficiency even for 1830, and they could not get payment of taxes. No less than 600,000 florins of the excise on wine remained unpaid, and 340,000 more were due by the manufacturers, but could not be recovered from them. It was absolutely necessary to borrow: Congress authorized a loan of 12,000,000 of florins, as if their name could be received on any exchange in Europe, or even among the capitalists of Belgium itself. The minister of finance, accordingly, soon afterwards declared that he had been unable to negotiate a loan, and proposed that, as no other means of raising money existed, the sum required should be procured by compelling the subjects to advance it as a forced loan—subjects whom they had no authority to compel to do anything.

For now every shadow of a government seemed to be at an end, except what was to be found in the populace and the clubs, who, during the last days of March, repeated the very scenes which had disgraced the capital in the preceding August. They began with plundering the office of an obnoxious journalist. They then attacked the houses of obnoxious manufacturers, that is, of men who did not join in all the phrenzies of these mad republicans. The impotent regent was helpless. He and his ministers could print proclamations, and make wild speeches, but they could not save the property of peaceful citizens

from popular pillage. In one instance the civic guard allowed the work of destruction to go on for a whole night, without offering to interfere; in another, they delivered up their arms in obedience to the summons of the mob. From the capital the spirit spread to other towns. At Liège, the populace made equally free with the property of the merchants, returning in the morning to complete the destruction which the weariness and intoxication of the preceding night had left imperfect, and that, too, in presence of the civic guard, and a detachment of cavalry. At Antwerp, although the merchants, apprehending similar scenes, had called on the military officers to take proper precautions against their occurrence, and had been assured by these persons, that all riotous assemblies would be met with promptitude; yet, while one house was plundered after another, the military and civic guard looked tranquilly on, or followed cautiously in their rear. At Ghent, the mob was allowed to proceed the length of murder, an unfortunate manufacturer having fallen beneath multiplied wounds. Namur, Ypres, and other towns, were polluted by similar exhibitions of unrestrained riot and pillage. The bonds of society seemed rent asunder; authority had lost its power; and a ragged rabble lorded it over the citizens. Nothing could be more ludicrously expressive of the weakness of all legal power, than the language of a motion made to Congress, to pass an act declaring "that the authors of the scenes of pillage shall be sought out, and *in future* the authorities shall be obliged to oppose such excesses by force of arms." But where the



populace reigned, no such laws could be allowed. Not one man was punished on account of these outrages. The Belgic association—a twopenny subscription club—ruled the government, dictated war, directed the populace against all moderate sentiments and the men who espoused them, and sent forth their emissaries to propagate riot and plunder in the provinces, under the pretext of punishing persons suspected to be well-inclined to the house of Orange. In the capital itself, they ordered to be seized and imprisoned, by their own authority, an officer whom they chose to suspect of Orangeism. The government did not dare either to guard the deed, or to liberate the prisoner. The Congress having passed to the order of the day on the mad proposal to declare war against Holland if it did not grant all they demanded within a month, the Belgic Association declared that it would itself raise men and undertake the vindication of the national honour. Its emissaries were with the troops, as well as among the populace, inciting incessant provocation, and rendering the preservation of peace a matter of supreme difficulty. It was not wonderful that all wise and moderate men retired from scenes where vanity, ignorance, violence, and extravagance were triumphant. Great part of the members of Congress resigned, and a great part of the remainder ceased to attend, leaving the wildness of the legislature, and the fooleries of the regency, in the hands of a small number distinguished by nothing but the absence of all wisdom in conducting human affairs, and who gratified their miserable self-conceit by being the

puppets of factious mobs, despised at home, and laughed at abroad. The men who, before the final separation of the provinces, had petitioned for redress of grievances, and would have been satisfied with legislative and administrative independence, had retired from the scene, for they were marked out to plunder and murder, and left the ground clear for even a more wretched set of intriguers than the knot who had first seized the reins of government, or had rendered themselves and their country ridiculous by running to Paris and London under the idea that they were diplomatists. They could not even agree among themselves. The cabinet of the regent was broken up, before he had been a fortnight in office, because each of its members, having a journal at his command, proceeded from the council-table to the office of the journal, revealed the secrets of the council, and abused his colleagues. M. de Brouckere, therefore, said, he could not sit with M. Van de Weyer, and M. Van de Weyer said, he could not sit with M. de Brouckere; while M. Gendebien paid the same compliment to M. Tielmans, and M. Tielmans to M. Gendebien, each accusing the other of treachery, slander, and defamation. This Van de Weyer, the diplomatist, who had declared in the Congress that he had received official notice of the readiness of the French court to accept the crown for the duke of Nemours, if he should be elected, and who had declared in the same place, on his personal knowledge as a commissioner in London for the Belgian government, that a hundred thousand Englishmen had stated to Parliament they would not pay



the taxes, if Belgium were interfered with, informed the Congress, after losing his office, that his colleague, M. Brouckere, had proposed in the council a plan for throwing Belgium into the arms of France; and his colleague, though very wrath that the deliberations of the council-table should be disclosed, did not deny the charge.

It was clear to all the world, that the injustice and obstinacy of Belgium rested in no small measure on the belief that France would at last support them in all their demands, and that the other Courts would take no active measures against them, lest any attempt to perform what Holland was entitled to demand, should lead to an union between Belgium and France, which could not have been removed without a war. The former of these impressions had been greatly strengthened by the letter of Sebastiani, disavowing the protocol of the 20th of January, a disavowal which remained too long undisclaimed. It was only on the 17th of April that France gave the pointed and special adhesion which the other Courts required, and even then the Belgian authorities seemed not one whit more inclined to yield. Men began to suspect that some secret game was going on, and that means would still be found to make the Conference of London revoke, in favour of Belgium, those articles which it had pledged itself should be irrevocable. The protocol of the 10th of May gave no countenance to these suspicions. The members of the Conference there declared that they would allow Belgium till the 1st of June, but no longer, "to place itself, according to its evident interest, in the

same position as the king of the Netherlands by the acceptance" of the articles already agreed on. If Belgium should not by that time accede, then the Conference declared, that a total rupture should take place of all relations between the five Powers, and the authorities who governed Belgium; that, so far from interfering, as they had hitherto done, to prevent the Germanic Confederation from occupying the grand duchy of Luxemburg for its defence, they would consider such measures absolutely necessary; and that if Belgium attacked Holland, the Conference would take steps to oppose such aggressions. The five Powers were thus once more solemnly pledged to execute the engagement on which Holland was relying, or to allow her to compel its execution by her own means. They could not possibly tell Holland that they would neither settle her quarrels for her, nor allow her to settle them herself.

In the mean time, the five Courts had agreed, that Prince Leopold of Saxe-Coburg would be a proper king for Belgium, if the Belgians could be brought to elect him. The choice could not be pleasing to France, whose ministers were sure to be represented as having succumbed to the influence of England in allowing Belgium to fall into the hands of a prince so intimately connected with the latter country. Agents from Brussels had already sounded the inclinations of the prince, but found that he would not accept a crown, so long as Belgium insisted that its king should quarrel with all Europe by maintaining all their demands. From that moment there seemed to commence a series of practices for overcoming the



difficulty by receding from engagements so repeatedly and distinctly confirmed. The first mention of the prince in connection with the Belgic policy was made in the protocol of the 21st of May. That document purported to proceed on information derived from lord Ponsonby the British minister at Brussels. It stated the Conference had learned, that the assent of Belgium would be greatly facilitated, if the five Powers would support it in getting Luxemburg for an indemnity, and that, "as the choice of a new sovereign had become indispensable to arrive at this final arrangement, the best means of obtaining the proposed object would be, to remove the difficulties which would impede the acceptance of the sovereignty by prince Leopold, in case, as there is every reason to believe, that sovereignty should be offered to him." It therefore authorized lord Ponsonby to declare, that though the five Powers would not enlarge the time for Belgium accepting the bases already settled, and by which Holland was already bound, yet "they would open a *negotiation* with the king of the Netherlands, in order to secure, *if possible*, to Belgium, for a just compensation, the possession of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, preserving always its relations to the Germanic Confederation." They further declared, that, on obtaining the assent of Belgium to "the bases of separation," they would inform the Germanic Confederation of the engagement now undertaken to commence a negotiation, and would invite that body to suspend, during the negotiation, the execution of the measures resolved upon for the military occupation of the grand duchy, but if this assent was not given by the 1st of June,

the dispositions of the protocol of the 10th of May were to be forthwith followed out. Conciliatory as all this was towards Belgium, who had been treating the five Courts with mere arrogance and violence, there was not perhaps any thing in it to rouse the suspicions of Holland, that a change of plan, or a breach of faith, was in contemplation. The cession of Luxemburg was to be "negotiated" with her; it would, therefore, remain for herself to accept or refuse the terms which might be offered. The language used was utterly irreconcilable with the idea that the five Powers could possibly mean to force upon her the cession of the grand duchy for any indemnity which they might think proper to be given. That idea would have been inconsistent with all good faith. The cautious language used by the members of the Conference, in representing the giving up of Luxemburg, even in exchange for an indemnity, as only a contingent concession which they might possibly obtain from Holland by means of negotiation, showed plainly their own conviction, that they could not, in honour or justice, propose such a change of agreement to Holland as a new and imperative condition. If Holland refused to cede, she and they were still bound by their ratified engagements. Accordingly, they still insisted on the unqualified accession of Belgium to these engagements as an indispensable condition even to the opening of a negotiation whose object was to be, to prevail on Holland to allow part of them to be changed.

In the mean time the Belgian government had attempted, during a brief adjournment of the Congress, to throw off all connection



with the Conference, and to obtain directly from Holland, what the five Powers had declared it would be injustice to ask. On the 9th of May, M. Lebeau, the Belgian foreign minister, addressed a communication to the government of the Hague, proposing that it should name three commissioners to meet with three Belgic commissioners, who should be empowered to settle the basis of a scheme of arrangement, which should then be submitted to the legislative bodies. This proposal was made under a threat, that, if it was not accepted, "Belgium would immediately proceed to a renewal of hostilities." The threat was ridiculous; the proposal itself was unmeaning. The bases of separation had been irrevocably fixed by the Conference; to these bases Holland had agreed; and even if she could have been asked to negotiate directly with revolted subjects whom no power in Europe had yet recognized, it was useless to ask such a negotiation for the purpose of making demands which the Conference had declared to be too unjust to be made even by them. There was not much modesty in requesting the king of Holland to yield to Belgium what the five great Powers had secured to him as against Belgium—and that such alone could be the nature of the demands now to be made was manifest from the fact, that the refusal of these demands by the Conference was the only reason why Belgium wished to open up this direct intercourse. The king of Holland had early taken his ground, by accepting the terms proposed by the Conference, however much he might feel that they were too favourable to the revolted provinces. The Confer-

ence was bound either to enforce these terms, or, withdrawing from the scene altogether, leave Holland and Belgium to settle their differences by negotiation or by arms, as they themselves might prefer. Looking at what Holland had done, and the relation in which the Conference stood both to her and to Belgium, there could be no greater impertinence than this threat to declare war, if Holland should refuse to disclaim the Conference, and enter into a direct negotiation.

War, however, did not follow, although the Belgians, at various points, and especially at Antwerp, where the Dutch still occupied the citadel, did every thing in their power to provoke it. In defiance of the armistice, the Belgian military authorities advanced their troops and posts beyond the line of demarcation, and began to erect works against the fort of St. Lawrence; general Chasse immediately occupied it with a body of troops. The Belgians had the impudence to complain of this defensive movement as a violation of the armistice—nobody, forsooth, was entitled to take military measures except themselves. Some firing took place, and general Beliard, the French agent, along with an English agent, hastened from Brussels to inquire into the affair. The Dutch commander told them at once, that, if the Belgians would be quiet, he would be quiet, as he had been; but he could not sit still, and allow them actually to carry on a siege. The Belgian officers promised that their proceedings should be stopped, but no sooner had the French and British agents returned to Brussels than the hostile operations were renewed, and were only suspended



by these agents insisting on the interference of the regent. As the Belgians, in Congress and in their state papers, uniformly accused the Dutch of being the violators of the armistice, general Belliard and his colleague gave direct testimony that the truth lay precisely the other way. In communicating to general Chasse that they had applied to the regent, so soon as they learned that the Belgians had renewed their operations against the citadel "in infraction of the law of nations, and of all military rules," they added, "We admired your prudence, and will make known your noble conduct in these difficult circumstances. The regent sends his most positive orders that every operation for a siege shall cease immediately, and that in future there shall be an abstinence from all hostile demonstrations against the lunette St. Laurent, which, by the capitulations of Antwerp, belongs to the citadel, and forms part of its defence. Should it happen, general, that the orders of the regent are not executed as promptly as may be desired, we believe that you will not regard this delay as a continuation of attack and menace, and that the prudence which characterizes you, as well as the love of country with which you are actuated, and of which you have just given such striking proofs, will also induce you to delay the execution of the measures of defence which you may be forced to adopt. We shall owe it to your prudence that peace has not been disturbed." The suggestion, that the general should not expect the immediate execution of the regent's orders, marks distinctly the miserable impotence of the government. Temporary obedience was all that

could be obtained. Firing with musketry at the military in the fortress was an every day occupation of the Belgian volunteers, and it passed unpunished only because the Dutch commander, seeing the total want of discipline and obedience in what was called the Belgian army, was averse to punish peaceful citizens on account of the violence of these military ruffians, who were but the tools of a party eager to raise the conflagration of a general war. The commerce of Antwerp was at a stand. Aware that the conduct of the Belgians might at any time provoke reprisals from the cannon of the citadel, the better class of the inhabitants removed in great numbers from a city where they were sitting on gunpowder. General Chasse, however, bore the teasing of the Belgian hornets with exemplary patience.

During the short recess of the Congress, agents of the government had been dispatched to London, to ascertain the inclinations of Prince Leopold, if the Crown should be offered to him. While Congress retained its present obstinacy and opinions, no prince in his sober senses could accept their throne. They pertinaciously refused to accept the conditions fixed by the Conference; and the Conference was irrevocably pledged to acknowledge no king of Belgium who did not accede to these conditions. The Belgic government was in direct opposition to the great Powers of Europe on the question of limits. By an article in the Belgic constitution, Luxemburg was included in the Belgic kingdom; and the Sovereign had to take an oath on his accession to preserve this, as well as the other parts of the Belgic



territory, inviolate. Thus, while Europe had declared that the grand duchy did not belong to Belgium, and the prince would have to swear to preserve it as an integral portion of its territory, his oath would involve him in a war with his allies. Regardless of this, when the Congress re-assembled on the 18th of May, the election of the prince seemed already to be certain. The war party, indeed, was as violent as ever, and made various proposals for immediately using arms to enforce all their demands—and it was to be lamented, that they were not allowed to indulge their braggard humour. Their anxiety for war was explicable on only one principle, viz. that they trusted, in the event of war, to the support of France, and that the rest of the courts, labouring under the same impression, would recede from their engagements with Holland, rather than risk a war which might call France into action. On the other hand, as the great majority were willing to elect a king whose acceptance was inconsistent with the repeated declarations of his electors, their conduct led to a suspicion that, in choosing a prince on whom the allies were agreed, they might claim merit with the Conference, and more particularly with England, with whose royal house that prince was nearly allied, and whose present ministers were supposed to have been, on other occasions, his private and confidential advisers.

On the 25th of May, a proposal, signed by ninety four members was submitted to Congress, that prince Leopold should be elected king of the Belgians, and it was urged, at the same time, that the election should take place with-

out delay. The 1st of June was the last day fixed for giving in their unqualified adhesion to the terms of the protocol of 20th January, with the contingent possibility of having them modified, with the consent of Holland, by negotiation. Their determination to reject these terms remained unaltered; instead of taking any step to adhere to these terms on the 1st of June, they resolved to proceed with the choice of a king in defiance of them, and to carry through this election at the very time which had been allowed them for a different purpose. The proposal made on the 25th, that prince Leopold should be king, had been referred, in common form to the sections. Their report was made on the 27th, and the result was, that ninety-six members of these sections voted for the prince, twenty-four reserved their votes, and two were negative. As the Congress, even when fully assembled, consisted of only 200 members, and no other candidate was in the field, the fate of the election, in so far as the electors were concerned, seemed to be determined.

Before they had proceeded further, they received the communication made by lord Ponsonby, in virtue of the protocol of the 21st of May. His lordship, however, gave the whole transaction a much more favourable colouring for Belgium than what it bore on the face of the protocol. He represented the cession of Luxemburg, not as a possibility which the five Powers would endeavour to effect by negotiation, but as a certainty which they would make good at all events, and the great motive by which he tried to persuade Belgium to give in her unqualified adhesion to



‘ the bases of separation,’ was, that the Conference would immediately take care to qualify them. In his official letter, dated 27th of May, his lordship wrote, “The Conference would see with pleasure the Belgian Congress elect some sovereign who might not personally interfere with the rights of other governments, and it will recognise with particular satisfaction the prince on whom the Belgians seem specially to have turned their eyes, provided the Congress will enable him to take his place in the common circle of the governments”—that is, by an unqualified acceptance of the terms to which they had pledged themselves over and over. Then came the assurance, that this unqualified acceptance would be only ostensible. “Belgium is excited to have recourse to arms, and why? To retain Luxemburg. But she may possess it in peace and security for a thousandth part of the price which an attempt to keep it by force of arms would cost. The hesitation which prince Leopold has manifested in his answer to the deputies who sounded his opinion, sufficiently shows the disinterested nature of his motives, and that he will not accept a crown if he cannot wear it with honour to Belgium and to himself. However, he is now convinced that he is sufficiently authorised to expect with confidence the equitable and speedy execution of the measures by which the Conference will assist in the satisfactory arrangement of the affairs of Luxemburg, and the prince is ready to take upon himself, as sovereign, the completion of this affair. Can there be a better proof of the change which has taken place in the opinions and resolutions of the Conference? A

week ago, they considered the preservation of that duchy to the House of Nassau to be, if not necessary, at least extremely desirable; and, at present, it is inclined to a mediation, with the avowed intention of obtaining it for the sovereign of Belgium. The honour of Belgium consists in obtaining Luxemburg, not in fighting for it.” This language seemed to imply, that the rights of Holland, and the pledges of the Conference, were to be sacrificed to the election purposes of prince Leopold. He was proposed to the Belgians as a candidate who would secure to them their great object—the possession of Luxemburg; as a prince who was authorized to expect with confidence the execution of the measures which would produce that desirable result. Nay, he knew so much of the intentions of the five Powers, that he could take the settlement of that affair upon himself as sovereign, which could only mean, that he knew they were determined to compel the submission of Holland to the “change which had taken place in their opinions and resolutions;” for if, while such language was held to Belgium, nothing more was intended than an attempt at negotiation, the success of which depended entirely on Holland, Belgium was deceived.

By the French, the war, and the republican party in the Belgic Congress, this communication was received with every term of insult and indignation. They would have it rejected at once, because there ought to be no negotiation about Luxemburg, and because it did not hold out the prospect of even negotiation as to Limburg and the left bank of the Scheldt. The majority, however, either saw the folly of resisting what was now offered,



or had reason to suppose that the promised negotiation would be converted, as the reward of their compliance, into something more certain and satisfactory. On the 1st of June, the Congress passed a decree, authorizing the government to open negotiations for the purpose of terminating all questions relative to territory by means of pecuniary sacrifices, the arrangements which might be made being afterwards to be submitted to Congress for its ratification. They then determined to proceed immediately to the choice of a sovereign. In all this they still set the Conference, and its engagements with Holland, at defiance. It was not a consent to negotiate for a purchase of Luxemburg, which had been requested from them by the 1st of June, but an unqualified accession to the terms already fixed, which excluded them from Luxemburg, subject to the mere possibility of obtaining it by negotiation, if Holland should be willing to accept a pecuniary, or any other equivalent. They were as far as ever from giving this accession; nay, the member of the government who proposed the decree took care to inform them, that even the election of Prince Leopold would be no adhesion to the fundamental bases—language which was utterly unintelligible, if the Conference meant to act honestly towards Holland. To elect a sovereign, while they refused to admit these bases, was to elect a sovereign whom the five Powers were bound to refuse to acknowledge. In the face of this, the Congress proceeded with the election; and it was not concealed, that to make prince Leopold their king would secure such an interference of the Conference, in defiance of its pledges, as would give

them Belgium on easy conditions, even against the will of Holland. The count de Merode, who had been one of the commissioners in London to consult the wishes and ascertain the opinions of the proposed sovereign, said, “In a few words I may state, that *the cause of Luxemburg is gained*, and we have found for our rising kingdom a chief disposed to come among us, whom all the Powers are ready to acknowledge, because he offers to each the guarantees thought necessary for their security:” and M. Lebeau, the foreign minister, said, “The Conference knew that no negotiations would be entered into except on the basis of the inviolability of the Constitution, and the integrity of the territory. In lord Ponsonby’s letter, in which the words ‘the prince is willing to take upon himself, as sovereign, the settlement of this affair,’ would be found the true meaning of the future negotiations. If the king of Holland *be obliged to yield* on this question, no objection would be urged by the German Diet, which would certainly not support king William, who was the opponent of their interests, in throwing obstacles as to the navigation of the Rhine.”

The election took place on the 3rd and 4th of June. No rival was named. Some members declared that they would vote for a native prince, and gave their voices for raising to the throne their tool and impotent regent, M. Surlet de Chokier. Of 196 members who were present, 152 gave their votes in favour of prince Leopold, and he was declared king on the 4th of June. The very decree, which contained his election, rendered acceptance impossible. It bore that he was not to take possession of the



throne, till he should have sworn to observe the Constitution, and to maintain the integrity of the territory. Now that constitution expressly declared that Luxemburg, as well as the other disputed territories, formed part of the state. A deputation of ten members was appointed to proceed to London to offer his royal highness the crown.

While these things were going on, the Dutch government, having learned the contents of lord Ponsonby's epistle, forthwith complained to the conference of its statement and tendency. The time, by which the five Powers had demanded the unqualified accession of Belgium as a condition of even attempting any thing farther in her favour, had expired. Even the protocol of 21st May had expressly declared, that if this was not done by the 1st of June, all communication between the five Powers and Belgium was to cease, and the measures agreed upon in that of the 10th of May, were to be executed. The 1st of June had passed, and instead of any one of those things being done, matters seemed to be taking a more favourable turn for Belgium, though she persisted in refusing that, without which it had been declared all relations between her and the five Powers were to be suspended. The Dutch plenipotentiaries had already given notice, on the 21st of May, that if Belgium did not consent to what had now been fixed as irrevocable bases, the king would consider himself free to act on his own account, in order to put an end to a state of uncertainty highly injurious to the interests of his subjects. On the 5th of June, when the appointed time had expired, they again applied to the

Conference, stating that fact, and requesting an explanation as to any information that might have been obtained, "in order that their sovereign, on learning the result, may take such measures as, in the present state of things, the dignity, as well as the safety of Holland, may require." Before next day, they had learned the terms of lord Ponsonby's letter to the Belgic government, and immediately gave in another note, objecting in the strongest manner "to everything which the agent of the Conference has thought fit to introduce regarding an eventual cession of the grand duchy. He has thereby flattered the engrossing spirit which has distinguished the revolt, and has encroached on the inalienable rights of the king, by promises directly opposed to the decided and unvaried language of his majesty's government." They then declared, "The king abides by the act of separation proposed by the five Powers and accepted by him without reservation. By article second of that act, the grand duchy is expressly acknowledged as belonging to the house of Nassau. It is, therefore, difficult to comprehend how any idea should have arisen of a negotiation respecting that sovereignty, which, even after the unconditional acceptance of the bases of separation by Belgium, would have been still subject to the greatest difficulties, because the duchy was granted to the king and the princes of his house in place of their hereditary possessions, and is, in his eyes, of inestimable value." To both of these notes the Conference returned answers on the 7th of June, and the answers were just another formal ratification of all that had hitherto



been done. The five plenipotentiaries there stated, that, according to the information which they had received, Belgium had not accepted the bases of separation; that lord Ponsonby had, therefore, been recalled; that the French agent at Brussels would receive orders to quit it at the same time; and that the Conference was employed in concerting those measures which their engagements with the king of the Netherlands might require. Professing to be ignorant of lord Ponsonby's letter, which they described to be confidential, though it had appeared in every newspaper in Belgium, they referred to and confirmed the provisions of the protocol of 21st May. "In that state paper these principles are laid down, viz., in the first place, that the arrangements which might give Belgium possession of Luxemburg should be entered into by mutual consent; secondly, that its possession should be obtained only in exchange for reasonable equivalents; and, in the third place, that the five Powers would make no proposition regarding the proposed arrangement, until the Belgians had submitted to the fundamental conditions of separation, with which the king of the Netherlands had complied. These principles are, and shall always continue to be, those of the five Powers. They in no way shackle the king of the Netherlands in acting as he thinks fit regarding that object." Thus it was again distinctly contracted with Holland, that all relations with Belgium should be broken off, unless she gave in her unqualified accession to the conditions of 20th January, as the irrevocable bases of separation; and that even when she should

have done so, any exchange of Luxemburg, being a departure from these irrevocable conditions, was to be sought for only by negotiation and mutual consent; and, if rejected by Holland on the one hand, or, on account of the equivalents demanded, by Belgium on the other, was to be dropped, leaving the separation of the two countries standing on the bases which had thus been so often and so solemnly declared, and which Belgium was to recognize, as the *sine qua non* of any attempts at farther negotiation.

Scarcely had the just complaints of Holland drawn from the members of the Conference this new assurance that they would adhere to their engagements, and break off all communication with the refractory Belgians, when the deputation from Brussels arrived in London to offer the crown to a prince elected in violation of every thing which these engagements contained. Prince Leopold declined the unmeaning honour—at least he did not accept it, and, in conformity with the answer given to the Dutch plenipotentiaries on the 7th of June, lord Ponsonby and general Belliard quitted Brussels. The case had now come to a simple issue between Belgium and the Conference. The former had refused to recognize those conditions which the latter had pledged itself must precede the recognition of any independence or sovereign in Belgium, or the maintenance of any political relations with its authorities, and without which it had declared that the Germanic Confederation must take military measures for the protection of Luxemburg as Dutch territory. Its course therefore was plain—either to enforce obedience itself, or to



leave unfettered the hands of Holland, which had been reposing so confidently in the sense of honour and justice, and the efficacy of their own repeated pledges. But instead of following either of these courses, a new series of negotiation was commenced in London, which terminated in actually making to Holland a new set of proposals for the separation of the two countries, favourable to Belgium in every thing, in which they varied from those which had been so frequently declared irrevocable, and all intended to secure the crown to Leopold free from those terms without which the Conference stood engaged to acknowledge no crown in Belgium. On the 26th of June, the prince informed the Belgic deputation that he at last accepted the proffered throne, and the same day produced a protocol containing, under the title of "Preliminaries," the new terms of a treaty to be concluded between William of Holland and Leopold of Belgium. In these preliminaries, the express exception of the grand duchy of Luxemburg from Belgium, on the clear ground that it belonged to the House of Nassau by a different title from that on which they had held the Belgic provinces, and had been given to them in return for other patrimonial inheritances of which they had been deprived for European purposes, was altogether omitted. It was to be made the subject of a negotiation between the two sovereigns "distinct from the question of boundaries," thus revoking the positive, final, and irrevocable judgment which had been pronounced in favour of Holland, and had been ratified again and again. Even Maestricht, on which, by that same judgment, not a doubt had

been allowed to rest, was now left a disputable matter by a provision that, "if it is found that the republic of the United Provinces did not exclusively exercise the sovereignty of Maestricht in 1790, the two parties shall consider of means of making an amicable arrangement on this subject." Besides other changes, the worst thing was, that Belgium was set free from the obligation to admit the original bases, before she could be received into political relationship. The Conference had declared, that if she did not admit them, as a condition of trying to negotiate an exchange of Luxemburg, which they declared to belong to Holland, Luxemburg must be occupied by the troops of the Confederation. Now they recalled the declaration that Luxemburg belonged to Holland; and they not only left Belgium at liberty to press her demand, which they themselves had determined to be unjust, unfettered by any prior condition, but declared they would take care, that, while the question was pending, the military occupation of the Grand Duchy should remain *in statu quo*. It was expressly agreed, however, that these proposed preliminaries were to be null and void, if rejected in whole, or in part, by Holland or by Belgium.

In the latter country they were not likely to encounter much opposition. Their acceptance was a condition of the acceptance of the crown by Leopold, while their very existence proved to the Belgians how powerfully the desire of the Conference to see that prince at their head had already operated in their favour. They were accepted, in defiance of the agitators of the Belgic association by 126 votes against 70. In defending them the foreign minister stated as



one of their greatest recommendations, that there was no similarity between them and the arrangements contained in the former protocols. He could not have used other language, if he had intended to satirize the vacillation of the five Powers, and this dissimilarity necessarily prevented their acceptance by Holland, which all along had been foolishly trusting to the engagements and pledges embodied in these former documents. The members of the Conference themselves seem to have felt that they were acting unworthily in now breaking asunder every obligation they had contracted; for, instead of communicating these preliminaries in the usual way, one of their own number, M. Weissenberg, a plenipotentiary of Austria, was dispatched to the Hague, to explain and justify their conduct, and urge their new proposals. The Dutch court, as might have been expected, refused to accept them, and called for the execution of the agreement to which it had trusted, or the unfettered power of compelling its execution at its own hand. His Dutch majesty pointed out in detail, the changes made upon former articles, and the entirely new terms which were introduced,—all of them unfavourable to Holland, and all of them inconsistent with the previous stipulations.\* On these stipulations, so

lately confirmed, Holland took its

of a treaty of peace between Holland and Belgium. From this comparison it appears that there is a very essential difference between the bases of the separation adopted by the king and the 18 articles, and that all the changes which the Conference now proposes to make in those bases are to the advantage of Belgium and the prejudice of Holland. A short development will suffice to prove both these facts.

“The second article of the Appendix A expressly excludes from the Belgian territory the grand duchy of Luxemburg, ‘which the princes of the House of Nassau possess by virtue of a different title, and which makes, and shall continue to make, a part of the German Confederation;’ the proposed articles leaving the right of the grand duke doubtful or silent in respect to this exclusion, in which not only the House of Nassau, but Holland, is interested, whose military defence is powerfully seconded by the support which the sovereignty of the House of Nassau or Luxemburg gives it, but would be weakened by the union of the grand duchy with Belgium.

“Nay, more, in the third article of the proposed preliminaries, the five Powers announce that they will employ their good offices to maintain the *status quo* in the grand duchy during the course of the separate negotiations which the sovereign of Belgium will open with the king of the Netherlands, and with the German Confederation, respecting the grand duchy. Now this *status quo* is an essential grievance, the redress of which his majesty has long since required.

“With respect to the unhindered intercourse of the fortress of Luxemburg with Germany, as the maintenance of it belongs exclusively to the German Confederation, the king, as grand duke, would be wanting in his duties towards the Confederation, if he recognized in this respect the competency of any foreign power. Besides, if the Belgians did not accede to Appendix A, the third article of the preliminaries is at variance with the note sent on the 17th of July, by the Conference, to the king’s plenipotentiaries, in which it is said ‘that the five Powers would not propose to the parties interested the exchange (or barter) of the grand duchy, till the Belgians shall accede to the basis of the separation laid down by the Conference, and al-

---

\* The following was the statement of the Dutch foreign minister in regard to these preliminaries:—

“The Appendix A to the 12th protocol, since the time of the assent of his majesty, and in connexion with the 11th and 12th protocols, of which this Appendix contains the result or summary, having become the unalterable basis of the negotiations, his majesty’s first care was to compare that Appendix with the 18 articles now proposed as preliminaries



stand. It recalled to the five Powers that, so late as the 7th of June, they had declared to its minister their determination to

uphold these engagements, even to the length of withdrawing their representatives from Brussels; that it now appeared the interval had

ready assented to by his majesty. It is true, according to the same note, the arrangement for securing the possession of the grand duchy to Belgium shall be made with mutual consent; that possession shall not be had but for a reasonable indemnity; these principles are those of the five Powers, and will always remain so; they by no means fetter the resolutions of the king: far from violating his rights, they respect them, and only tender in return for equivalents what his majesty judges acceptable, and on the basis of reciprocal advantages to make arrangements, the only object of which should be, to confirm the duration of peace.

"It is again true that such an exchange (in barter) wherein it may be brought forward, exclusively appertains to the king and to the German Confederation,—a principle unequivocally expressed by the two most powerful states, and other members of it. But these considerations do not do away with the fact that Art. 2 and 3 of the preliminaries contain an essential alteration to the prejudice of his majesty.

"Of Appendix A, the abandonment of Art. 9, of the Appendix, seems again to have decided the question in favour of Belgium. It was reserved in it whether it might be possible to extend to the neighbouring countries the benefit of the neutrality pronounced to Belgium,—a reserve that seems to be applicable to Luxemburg, but which seems to have been thought unnecessary in the new articles, in consequence of the proposed union of the grand duchy with Belgium.

"The 4th article of the preliminaries is new. It calls in question the exclusive exercise of the sovereignty in the town of Maestricht by the republic of the United Netherlands in 1790. If these doubts were well founded, which cannot be acknowledged, the circumstance would prove nothing to Belgium, which has no more right than Holland to the bishoprick of Liège.

"According to article 4, Appendix A, such exchanges and arrangements between the two countries shall be made by the law of the five Powers, that they

shall secure the reciprocal advantage of a connected territory and an unimpeded intercourse between the towns and places included within the frontiers. Now as Belgium has some *enclaves* in the ancient territory of the United Provinces, it was evidently advantageous to Holland. The preliminaries, however, merely speaking of amicable negotiations between Holland and Belgium, for the advantage of both, no mention is made of a continuous territory, of unimpeded intercourse, or of the obligations of the five Powers to obtain arrangements which shall secure these advantages to both countries.

"The 6th article of the preliminaries is not in appendix A.

"It says,—'The reciprocal evacuation of the towns and places shall be made independently of the arrangements relative to the exchanges.' Now this evacuation before all is settled, would deprive Holland of the chief security that it possesses against a country in a state of revolution, to see that which shall be determined carried into effect. This security is confirmed to Holland by the Conference itself, which in Appendix A to protocol No. 10, declared to the persons holding power in Belgium, that if the Belgic troops had not returned on the 20th January to the positions which they occupied on the 21st of November, the citadel of Antwerp should not be evacuated, and it is proved that on the 20th of January the Belgic troops had not returned to those positions.

"According to the 7th article of the preliminaries, the right of Belgium to partake in the navigation of the Rhine along the inland waters between that river and the Scheldt, shall be the subject of a particular negotiation between the parties interested, in which the five Powers will employ their good offices. It is important to observe how impossible it is to accept this proposal, which is not mentioned in appendix A. Indeed, however ready the king is immediately to enter into negotiations to regulate the free navigation of the Scheldt, according to the act of the Congress at Vienna, his majesty cannot accept in these ne-



been employed in contriving means to escape from these engagements, and unexpectedly to send forth the project of a new arrangement ut-

terly at variance with the first, extremely injurious to the acknowledged rights of Holland, flowing apparently from an agreement with

gotiations the good offices of other Powers, especially when they are themselves parties interested in the point to be decided. This consideration too nearly affects his majesty's dignity, the independence of Holland, and the respect which the Powers have for the independence of all nations, to be silent any longer.

"The use of the Dutch canals is free to all nations; the same is the case in Belgium. A special agreement, which should declare the use of the canal from Ghent to Terneuze, and of the Zuid, Willems Vaart, common to the inhabitants of both countries, would be a deviation from the general principle.

"The 8th article of the preliminaries passes over in silence article 5 of appendix A, according to which the five Courts, in case there should be any difference between the commissioners appointed to fix the frontier line, which could not be amicably adjusted, should employ their intervention to remove those differences in such a manner as should be most conformable to the principles of the separation. A simple refusal on the part of the Belgian commissioners would, therefore, have been sufficient to stop every thing.

"The 9th article, though nearly similar to the 6th of Appendix A, is not so precise with respect to the exclusion of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, which is not mentioned in article 2.

"The 12th and 13th articles are instead of the nine last articles of appendix A respecting the partition of the debt. They are wholly incomplete, and lay down a very different basis, by which the indemnification and the manifold sacrifices of Holland appear to have been lost sight of. The Hague is no longer mentioned as the place for the meeting of the commissioners. No more is said of the intervention of the five Powers, in case of differences that cannot be amicably adjusted, to arrange them in a manner conformable to the determination already made,—an omission which will give the Belgian commissioners an opportunity to avoid all arrangements. According to article 13, the first business of the united

commissioners for liquidating the debt shall be to determine the share which the Belgians are to pay provisionally, in expectation of the final settlement, on account of the interest of the debt mentioned in the preceding article. Article 17 of appendix A, on the contrary, makes this payment wholly independent of the meeting of the commissioners, by determining that Belgium shall be bound to pay, provisionally, its share for discharging the interest, and for the redemption of the debts of the kingdom of the Netherlands, according to the proportion of articles 10 and 11, till the business of these commissioners shall be completed. This difference appears to be very important, since, according to article 13 of the preliminaries, it will be sufficient for Belgium to delay sending the commissioners, to defer, at the same time, the payment of its share of the interest of the debt.

"These important considerations have more weight when we refer to the principles which guided the Conference in regulating the debt of the kingdom of the Netherlands, and which are so clearly expressed in the introduction to the protocol of the 27th of January. Among the considerations to come to in dividing the debt, there were undoubtedly points which depended only on the option of Belgium, &c. &c.; but what gave Holland a security, and by which his majesty was particularly induced to accede, not only to the basis of separation as far as the frontiers were concerned, but also to the arrangements "which were proposed" for the partition of the debt, was the assurance 'that the future sovereign of Belgium,' as the conclusion of the 12th protocol expresses it, 'should be obliged to accede to the arrangements contained in that protocol;' that is to say, those which relate to the division of the debt. How, then, after these facts, can the king be now satisfied with an arrangement which shall exclude the debts that Holland has incurred, solely as a consequence of the union, and the value of the sacrifices which Holland has made to obtain it, and thus accept an agreement, which, far from fulfilling



those who exercised power in Belgium, and bearing the stamp of the successful endeavours made by the Belgians in London, as well as of the ardent wish to agree to every thing which might secure them a favourable reception in Belgium. "After the example of the most powerful sovereigns, the king will yield to the necessity of leaving to their fate those of his subjects who have withdrawn themselves from his authority, but he will never sacrifice to them the

the just expectations of its faithful subjects, would expose their property to a severe shock?

"Article 15 supposes a fact which does not exist in Holland, where no person's property has been sequestered in consequence of the Belgian insurrection. By accepting this new article we should acknowledge ourselves guilty of an injustice which the Belgian government alone had committed. The new article is besides defective, and when it is compared to article 14 of the appendix, it is almost doubtful whether the patrimonial property and domains of the House of Orange are not to be excluded from the removal of the sequestration.

"Your excellencies will allow me to close this parallel with a general observation, that is applicable to several essential articles of the proposed preliminaries: it is, that instead of the precision and clearness of the appendix A, we here find indefinite and vague phraseology, which is doubly dangerous when arrangements are to be made, not with a government established upon firm foundations, but with a country in a state of revolution, whose neutrality being once recognized, may hinder the recourse to arms in case a reasonable declaration respecting disputed points should be evaded, and in respect to which the five Powers are contented, in article 17, with offering their good offices, if they should be required by the parties interested, without engaging, and without expressing, whether these good offices will be given at the desire of one of the two parties, and without positively declaring, as in appendix A, that they will interpose with their medi-

rights of Holland. A mature examination having convinced him that the preliminary articles would sacrifice the dearest interests of Holland to the insurrection, he cannot accept them, and he again demands of the five Powers the execution of the reciprocal engagements between the five Powers and himself, which the Conference has already declared to be irrevocable." He puts them in mind, that the preservation of peace did not depend upon Belgium alone,

ation, to settle disputed points in the manner most conformable to the principles laid down in that appendix. Thus, very far from furnishing any data whatever for the division of the debt, the frontiers and other objects which must be regulated, the preliminaries give, on the contrary, means to Belgium to throw every thing into confusion by partial interpretations. The discussion, to which these preliminaries have already given occasion in Brussels, have but too fully confirmed this truth, and the language held by him who in fact directs the foreign affairs of Belgium, sufficiently proves what Holland would have to expect from the assent of his majesty to the proposed preliminaries. The developments and declarations into which he entered, are the more remarkable, as it is he who by his situation has necessarily directed the negotiations and endeavours of the Belgian commissioners at London, and must be considered as acquainted with all the circumstances. Besides these observations on the spirit of these articles, it must be observed, that the new form which has been chosen of preliminaries of a treaty of peace contains an implied determination of the point of sovereignty, which was left untouched in the 12th protocol and its appendix A, in which only the separation is treated of. But even on the supposition that the king should agree that the solution of this important question should be laid in the scale of the arrangement between Holland and Belgium, his majesty would never assent to this without reasonable equivalents—that is to say, upon conditions which the rights, the good cause, and the interests of Holland require.



and, above all, that the election or recognition of a king in violation of the concluded agreement, could be nothing less than a declaration that Belgium was determined to support by arms what the Powers unanimously had determined to be unjust, "With respect to the choice of a sovereign, the king refers to the declaration of the five Courts in the 12th and 19th protocols, that, in their opinion, the sovereign of the country must answer the principles of the existence of the country itself,—must furnish, by his personal situation, a guarantee for the safety of the neighbouring states,—and must accept, without reserve or distinction, the arrangements which had been laid down." In consequence of this declaration, which, by his majesty's acceptance of the bases of separation to which it applied, became an engagement with him, his majesty, in case a prince should be called to the sovereignty of Belgium, and take possession of it without first accepting these conditions, could not but consider such prince, as by this fact alone, placed in a state of hostility with him, and as being an enemy.

It was difficult to see how the five Powers could answer these demands of Holland, nor does it appear that they attempted it. The preliminaries were to fall, if not approved of by both Holland and Belgium. M. Lebeau had taken care to flatter the Belgian Congress, by announcing that either state was at liberty to reject them in whole, or in part; and that if either refused them in whole or in part, they were to be null and void. Holland had rejected them entirely. They were, therefore, at an end—having never been more than proposals that Holland

should depart from her claims under irrevocable engagements. Those engagements remained in their full vigour, and the five Powers were bound to proceed to execute every thing they had stipulated to perform on the 20th and 27th of January, 19th of February, 10th and 21st of May, and 7th of June. Above all they were bound to tell prince Leopold, that, as Belgium had not acceded to the fundamental and irrevocable bases of separation, it was impossible they could recognize either him or his intended kingdom—that they could maintain no political relations with him—that military measures would immediately be adopted to secure the territories which the injustice of his electors, in defiance of all Europe, threatened with invasion. The Conference thought otherwise. They gave their solemn engagements with Holland to the wind; they authorized Leopold to proceed to take possession of the throne, without one of the conditions which they were pledged to enforce, and to swear to a constitution framed, as regarded the territory of the new state, in contempt of these conditions. It now appeared plain that, to secure his election, they had resolved to trample honour and justice under foot.

The prince, proceeding by Calais, Ostend, Ghent, and Bruges, arrived at Brussels on the 19th of July. In the towns through which he passed he was received with loud acclamations, wise men rejoicing at the apparent approach of something resembling a fixed government, and all men feeling confident that the Powers who had allowed him to be installed would maintain the work of their hands—a confidence rendered not the less pleas-



ing by the conviction that, in gaining a king, they had compelled all the great courts of Europe to treat Holland with insult and injustice. On the 21st he was formally installed king of the Belgians, in presence of the Congress, who having thus effected a revolution, and created and filled a throne, resigned their power to make way for the representative body which was to be elected under the new constitution. Leopold took the oath required by that same constitution, swearing to observe the laws of the Belgians, "and to maintain the national independence, and the integrity of the territory."

Holland, thus deceived and deserted by the Conference, relied on her own resources. By the repeated declarations of the Conference itself, Leopold was a king not to be acknowledged either by them or by her; he had accepted the crown on terms which, by their own confession, made him an enemy of Holland, and an enemy against whom they were bound to lend her all aid and encouragement. If they would not interfere to compel the execution of their own irrevocable decrees, how could they prevent Holland from enforcing them, if she would? The new king, by swearing to the constitution, had sworn to retain territory which the five Powers had secured to Holland, and the Belgian claim to which they themselves had acknowledged to be inconsistent with the safety of neighbouring states. The Dutch government, in consequence both of the daily chance of war from the wanton attacks of the Belgic soldiery, and of the probability that arms alone would bring down the braggard pertinacity of the Belgian authorities,

had maintained and increased its military force. It was supported by the unanimous spirit of the people, indignant at the duplicity and injustice with which they had been treated, and at the wantonness with which engagements and rights had been violated to gratify the unprincipled encroachments of the rebel provinces, and soothe down the ambition of France. On the 12th of July, in its answer to the Preliminaries, Holland had declared that the receiving in Belgium of a king, who did not adopt the final bases of separation, would be an act of hostility, and that king would be an enemy. Such a sovereign had been received; he had been received with the sanction, and attended by the agents, of those very Powers, whose word was violated by his appearance: they could not, therefore, plead ignorance of the necessary consequences. The king of Holland, on the 1st of August, declared the armistice at an end, and prepared to enforce by arms the rights which Europe had declared to be his. A despatch, bearing that date, was addressed to the five Powers, stating, that, while he was still willing to negotiate a definitive treaty on the terms which had been concluded between them and himself, "he was determined on supporting these negotiations by military measures, a determination which the recent events in Belgium have rendered imperious, since a prince has put himself in possession of the sovereignty of that country, without having previously fulfilled the conditions established by the Conference, and has taken an unrestricted oath to a constitution derogatory to the territorial rights of Holland." His operations were only to be, "for the purpose of



arriving at that state of things, which the act of separation had acknowledged to be just and convenient."

Accordingly, the king of Holland, while he authorized his representatives in London to conclude a definitive treaty whenever the allies should return to the conditions from which they could not recede without disgrace, gave notice that the suspension of arms would terminate on the 4th of August, and that he would then proceed to compel, by force, the execution of the terms which the Conference had declared to be the only terms that reason or justice allowed. The Belgians, whose voice had ever been so loud for war—who, in the pride of their wordy violence, had not merely threatened to inflict signal punishment upon Holland, but had dared the combined powers of Europe, had now the amplest field for exhibiting their valour. The contest, which they had so earnestly desired, took place; and, forthwith, amidst the loud ridicule of all Europe, their wordy champions proved mere braggard cowards. The population of Antwerp, whose city lay at the mercy of the guns of the citadel, though in the greatest danger, escaped unhurt. The Dutch commander attacked and carried some forts, and spiked the cannon, the Belgian volunteers and civic guards, when it came to actual fighting, presenting no serious resistance; but not a shot was fired to endanger the city. General Belliard, the French agent, hastened from Brussels; general Chasse, having secured himself, agreed to a suspension of arms, till he should receive farther instructions from the Hague, and Antwerp was left unmolested.

The main body of the Dutch army entered Belgium in the direction of Turnhout and Diest. It was commanded by the prince of Orange. One body of the Belgian troops was concentrated at Mechlin, whither Leopold had repaired in person. The main body, called the army of the Meuse, under the orders of general Daine, was stationed towards Maestricht, in the neighbourhood of Hasselt. Between these two points the Dutch army approached the Gele. On the 5th of August, it made itself master of Diest, the Belgians having abandoned the town without offering to resist, and extending its right to Haelen, while the left occupied Sichein, had thus completely prevented any junction between the army commanded by Leopold at Mechlin, and the army of the Meuse. The latter was the first object of the Dutch. On the 8th, they attacked it in its position near Hasselt. There was no battle; it was an instantaneous and disgraceful rout. The "brave Belgians," as they had been styling themselves for twelve months, daring Holland to encounter their patriotic valour in defence of liberty, fled almost without firing a shot. The cavalry, which was the first to fly, ran away through the infantry scattering their own crowds of civic guards. The race from one place to another immediately began, and neither the dispersed army, nor their general, stopped till they reached Liège, having been altogether cut off from Brussels.

The Dutch immediately turned towards Brussels, which had no protection but the troops collected at Mechlin, under the command of Leopold in person. On the day of the rout of the army of the Meuse, the prince had advanced



to Aerschot, in the direction of Diest. On learning that defeat, he moved upon Louvain, to cover the capital, taking up a position in front of the former. On the 12th, the Dutch attacked him, turned his position, and he was forced to commence a hasty retreat upon Louvain. While one division of the Dutch army, by moving to the left, cut him off from Brussels, the main body followed him on the road to Louvain. In the pursuit the prince of Orange was met by a British messenger from the Hague, bringing intelligence that a French army had entered Belgium to support the new king, and requesting a suspension of hostilities. The prince refused to consent, except on condition that Louvain should be surrendered to his troops; and, obtaining undoubted assurance of a French army having interfered, he dispatched an officer to ascertain this fact, and in the meantime attacked prince Leopold in a new and strong position which he had taken up in front of Louvain. One point was carried after another, and the Belgians, to avoid total defeat, agreed to evacuate Louvain by next day. They obtained, till that period, a suspension of hostilities, it being certain that a large division of the French army was already in the immediate vicinity of Brussels. On the 13th accordingly, Louvain was delivered up to the Dutch troops — which terminated the campaign. On the same day, the prince of Orange received orders from the Hague to retire, with his army, within the Dutch frontiers, the Conference having determined that Holland should not be allowed to enforce the engagements the fulfilment of which they were themselves bound to have com-

pelled. Prince Leopold, who had retreated from Louvain to Meehlin, returned to Brussels, his army covered with disgrace, himself filled with disgust, and indebted to the interposition of foreigners for the preservation of his crown and his capital, if not of his personal freedom. Nine days had dissolved all the dreams, and struck down all the vauntings of his boasting subjects, and had proved to Europe, that, if Belgium and Holland had only been allowed to settle their own affairs, the latter would have been found a much more decisive negotiator than the Conference of London.

The march of the French army had been the act of the French government without any communication with her allies. Prince Leopold, when he learned that hostilities were to be renewed, instantly hurried off to Paris a supplication for assistance, and the French cabinet immediately ordered 50,000 men under Marshal Gerard, accompanied by two of the king's sons, to enter Belgium, and drive back the Dutch. The first division of this army arrived at Brussels on the 12th of August, and stopped by its approach the triumphant course of the Dutch army; for the king of Holland, once informed that the five Powers, not satisfied with refusing to execute by military measures the stipulations by which they were bound to him, had resolved to employ force to prevent their execution, yielded to necessity, and withdrew his troops. The Conference addressed a letter to him on the 5th of August, pretending that although the dispatch of his minister of 1st August had distinctly informed them of the king's intention to support "by military



measures" the negotiations for definitively concluding a treaty on the terms already settled, "they would have supposed that these measures would be adopted only *in the interior of the territory of Holland*, if public report did not inform us that they had been extended beyond its frontiers—that hostilities have been resumed against the Belgians by the king's orders, and that the armistice concluded at Antwerp has just been denounced," and that they could not believe "that the king, at the very moment when he communicated his intention of negotiating a definitive treaty of peace, can have taken the resolution to rekindle the flames of war." They therefore requested that the Dutch troops should retire within the frontiers of Holland, and that Antwerp should not be made the object of any hostile attack. The attempt to accuse Holland of duplicity, as if she had sent an ambassador to negotiate at the very time when she was secretly resolved upon war, was a new insult to her government. The Conference had been distinctly told that the treaty which this ambassador was sent to negotiate was to be, not a treaty founded on the preliminaries—for these had been unhesitatingly rejected—but on the "irrevocable bases" already fixed; and this negotiation they had been as distinctly told would be supported by military measures. Besides the dispatch of 1st of August, they had before them another stating that "his majesty, after nine months of fruitless negotiations, which have been without the slightest advantage to Holland, and during which he has never ceased to give proofs of his sincere desire to terminate amicably

his dispute with Belgium, has judged that, unless he were to sacrifice the most vital interests of Holland, without the maintenance of which indeed she would be unable to exist, he must renounce all hope of obtaining from the Belgians reasonable terms of separation, except through coercive measures, to which it was likewise the more indispensable for his Majesty to have recourse, because the existing crisis could not be prolonged without at once endangering our public spirit, our finances, our army, and our political existence. His majesty, on the other hand, has reason to believe, that the appearance of his troops in Belgium will have a tendency to restore the balance of the negotiations overturned by those means which the insurrection has successfully employed, whilst Holland remained in a purely defensive attitude. Therefore, unquestionably, the king's resolution to throw his army into the scale, simultaneously with the negotiations carrying on in London, for the sake of obtaining equitable terms of separation,—an object too precisely pointed out, and too frankly avowed, to give pretence for the slightest doubt,—ought not to inspire uneasiness." Sebastiani, the French foreign minister, at the moment he was ordering French troops to march, forgot still further the relation in which the five Powers stood to Holland. He characterized the movement of the Dutch army as an "unjust aggression"—"a violation of the independence and neutrality of Belgium which had been recognized by the great Powers of Europe," and he ordered the French minister to quit the Hague, if the Dutch army did not immediately return within the line



of the armistice. This was not true. The neutrality and independence of Belgium had never been declared, except as a condition of her acceding to the irrevocable terms which had been imposed upon Holland; that condition Belgium had constantly, contemptuously, and finally rejected; and the five Powers, at the very moment when they spoke of the violation of Belgian independence and neutrality, were solemnly pledged to acknowledge neither the one nor the other. It was impossible therefore, to make any reply to the answer of the Dutch government, "We are not aware, that the independence and neutrality of Belgium have been recognized by the five Powers, unless Belgium accepted the conditions of separation established by those Powers themselves, and so far from endangering that independence and neutrality, the march of the Dutch troops has no other object than to realize the coercive measures announced by the five Powers, in the event of Belgium refusing to accept Appendix A of the 12th Protocol. To call this march an unjust aggression is tantamount to declaring that the five Powers have committed an injustice in establishing the basis of a separation contained in the said Appendix, and in adopting the principle, that in order to gain their acceptance by the Belgians, coercive measures, if necessary, would be resorted to." It was added, however, that as the Dutch army was never intended to act against any of his majesty's allies, if a French army should present itself, the former would retire within the limits of Holland.

This was the triumph of might; for the Conference of London, however uneasy at first at the vo-

luntary haste of France, had approved of her proceedings, and a British fleet had been ordered to assemble in the Downs to act, if necessary, in furtherance of the same object. By a Protocol of 6th August, the explanation was admitted as satisfactory, that France, from the extreme urgency of the case "had not had time to fulfil the obligation, which she was fully desirous to do, of acting in concert with her allies. It was declared, however, that the French troops should not pass the ancient frontiers of Holland, that their operations should be confined to the left bank of the Meuse, that, under no circumstances, should they invest the fortress of Maastricht, or that of Venloo, because then the war would be carried too near the frontiers of Prussia and Germany, and might give rise to serious and complicated questions, and that they should return to France so soon as the Dutch should have returned to Holland. The last of these provisions was not agreeable either to the fears and necessities of Leopold, or to the pride and ambition of France. Although it was thus a positive stipulation, the French minister of war, while informing the Chamber of Deputies (August 13) that he had received official intelligence of the withdrawing of the French troops, added, "however, our troops will not return to France on that account. They will take up convenient positions, in order to afford us the certainty that the Dutch will not return." The Conference, however, saw no reason to doubt the good faith of Holland, and could not but suspect bad faith in a French army occupying these "convenient positions." They insisted successfully that the stipulation to recall the French army



should be fulfilled, although this much was conceded, that it should not retire all at once, 12,000 men having been allowed to remain for a couple of weeks longer, and that a number of French officers should be permitted to enter the service of Leopold, to assist in organizing a Belgian army. At the same time, the Conference, by a Protocol dated 23rd August, proposed to Holland and Belgium a suspension of hostilities for six weeks, to be guaranteed by the five Powers, who would take advantage of it to bring about a final settlement. Both states accepted the proffered armistice.

Temporary peace being thus restored, the Belgians occupied themselves with the election of their first representative body under their new constitution. The Belgian minister had the confidence to apply to the Germanic Diet for an order on the military commandant at Luxemburg that he should present no obstacle to the election of its deputies, as if it had been already declared a portion of the Belgic kingdom. The Diet knew Luxemburg only as a territory belonging to its grand duke the king of Holland, and would grant no such permission.

The Congress assembled on the 8th of September, prince Leopold opening the session with the following speech.

“Gentlemen,—I am happy to be for the second time amidst the representatives of the nation.

“The proofs of affection and devotedness which the Belgic nation has not ceased to give me from the moment that I set my foot on the territory of my adopted country, have filled my heart with lively gratitude. This voluntary transport of a whole nation, while it inspires me with very

allowable pride, has made me sensible of the full extent of the duties that are imposed on me. I do not dissemble to myself any of the numerous difficulties of my situation; but with the aid of your knowledge and experience I shall be able to overcome them.

“When the principles laid down in the constitution which I have sworn to observe shall have received, by the projects of law which will be submitted to your consideration, the developement which they still require, Belgium will enjoy a greater degree of liberty than any other nation in Europe. The crisis, through which the country has had to pass, in order to attain its political regeneration, has for a moment affected its material interests.

“It must henceforth be the object of our united efforts to promote their interest, by encouraging manufactures and opening new channels to commerce.

“The relations already so happily established with France and England, and which I hope will soon be extended to the other Powers, will facilitate the performance of this task.

“Negotiations have just been opened to effect a definitive arrangement of our differences with Holland. The honour and interests of the Belgian nation will be defended in them with perseverance and dignity. With you, gentlemen, and the whole nation, I look with confidence to the issue of those negotiations, the result of which will be laid before you.

“The neutrality of Belgium, guaranteed by the five Powers, has suggested the possibility of modifications in its system of defence. This possibility, the principle of which is admitted by the Powers concerned in the erection



of the fortresses of 1815, will, I doubt not, be acknowledged by the nation. Negotiations will take place to regulate the execution of the measures connected with the demolition of some of these fortresses. Happy in being able to draw closer the ties which unite the two people, Belgium will, on this occasion, give a proof of its gratitude to France,—Europe, a striking pledge of its just confidence in the honour of the king of the French.

“ The eminent services rendered by France involuntarily call our attention to a recent event, the consequences of which I must say have been too much exaggerated. Belgium confiding to excess in the engagements contracted by Holland towards the five Powers, to which it had itself subscribed, was suddenly surprised by an army, the force of which far exceeded that which Belgium could oppose to it.

“ In these painful circumstances the succour of friendly powers became urgent and indispensable. You know with what generous promptness it was afforded us.

“ If individual courage, if the bravery which has never been denied the Belgic soldier, could have made up for the want of organization and union which was felt in our young army, without doubt—(and you will believe my testimony)—without doubt we should have victoriously repulsed an unjust aggression, contrary to all the principles of the law of nations. The nation will be but the more sensible of the absolute necessity of the reforms already commenced, and which are prosecuted with a degree of activity, the results of which will be soon apparent. In a few days Belgium will have an

army, which, if it should be again necessary, would be able to rally round its king to defend with honour and with success the independence and the rights of the country.

“ Projects of law will be laid before you during this session, to give to the government its legitimate share of influence in the composition of the army, to restore confidence to the soldier, and to secure a just recompense to those who shall distinguish themselves in the day of danger.

“ Gentlemen, I will call your particular attention to the state of our finances. I know the care which this essential part of the public service requires. The prevailing desire of my government will always be successively to introduce in the public expenditure the economy which is so loudly called for by the state of society, and by the aid of which it will be practicable gradually to lessen the burdens of the people.

“ At present, nevertheless, sacrifices are still necessary, on the one hand, to defray the expenses of the reorganization of the army; on the other, to make up for a diminution in the revenues, which the circumstances in which we are for a time placed indicate as inevitable. The nation has proved that it did not shrink from the sacrifices which the honour and the interest of the country required. It will also know how to bear those of which the government shall have proved the necessity. The confidence with which the whole nation has hitherto met its king, gives me a right to reckon on its representatives in all the measures which may contribute to the good of the country. My hopes will not be disappointed.



Belgium will see us animated by the same desires to labour in concert for the happiness and glory of this country, to which I shall not cease to devote all my solicitude, as I have already devoted to it my dearest affections."

The statement of the prince, that Belgium had been surprised in consequence of her confidence "in engagements contracted by Holland towards the five Powers," and the proposition which these words, if they had any meaning, involved, that Holland had taken arms in violation of her engagements, could be explained only from the necessity under which the new king found himself of sacrificing the truth to soothe the wounded vanity of his new subjects. The Congress proceeded to try to contrive means for raising money to support an army and the expenses of being governed. The government applied itself to organizing an army, and other necessary means of military defence. Fortifications were raised, and entrenched camps were formed, on different points towards the Dutch frontier, and the troops were exercised in sham battles, in which one side was uniformly victorious. But enough had already been done to convince all Europe that Belgium could not maintain herself against Holland, with only about one-half of the population of the former. The Conference again interfered to prevent the dethronement of Leopold on the expiring of the suspension of arms, which was to terminate on the 25th of October. They demanded that Holland should inform them what she meant to do when the truce should be at an end. The king of Holland answered, that "the Powers were at liberty to arm themselves

against his measures, when he should have adopted any, and that they were equally at liberty to arm themselves against his silence; that he was not under any obligations to let them know before hand his intentions for the moment of the expiration of the armistice, and that even if he should be thereunto obliged, very many circumstances might in such times as the present occur, which would change the intentions which his majesty should have communicated." The Conference, therefore, determined, by a protocol of 24th October, that Britain should immediately station a naval force on the coasts of Holland, that it should have orders not to act, till hostilities were resumed by Holland against Belgium, but should take, on their being resumed, the measures best adapted for bringing about, in the speediest manner, a complete cessation of hostilities. Thus, while the Conference would neither itself use force, nor allow Holland to use force, for executing the engagements existing between them, it did not hesitate to abuse its power to render effectual its own breach of faith towards that Holland which alone, throughout the whole truckling affair, had acted with any degree of spirit, of honesty, and of fair plain-dealing. Holland, avoided the ridiculous bravados of Belgium, and yielded to the impossibility of resisting unjust power.

The Conference, in the mean time, had again been labouring to arrange the terms of pacification. They had already departed, by tendering the preliminaries, from the original terms which they had bound themselves to procure for Holland. By the latter the preliminaries themselves had been rejected. The



five Powers now agreed on a third set of conditions, different from both, declaring that they would listen to no proposal for any alteration, and would make the acceptance of them by both parties compulsory. These terms were comprehended in twenty-four articles, forming what was styled a definitive treaty. Luxemburg was to be divided, Holland giving up more than one half of it, and receiving, in return, as "a territorial indemnity," a portion of those parts of the province of Limburg which otherwise would have belonged to Belgium — the exchange, which had never been proposed but as a matter to be negotiated with the consent of Holland, being thus imposed upon her against her will, while it was estimated that she received a population less by 50,000 souls than that which she was called on to surrender. The left bank of the Scheldt with Maestricht were still to remain with Holland as had been originally proposed, along with Venloo. The navigation of the Scheldt was to be regulated according to the principles laid down in the general act of the Congress of Vienna, but Belgium was to have the right of navigating certain of the internal canals of Holland, lying wholly within the territory of the latter country. In apportioning the debt, the Conference assumed the amount of interest payable at 27,700,000 florins, of which Belgium, as appeared from the budgets of 1827, 1828, 1829, had paid  $\frac{16}{31}$ , and Holland  $\frac{15}{31}$ . It found that the interest of the debt which had been incurred since the union amounted to ten millions and a half of florins, which was to be divided equally between Holland and Belgium. The latter was to have exclusively the Austro-Belgic debt, which had

existed before the union, and the interest of which was taken, in round numbers, at 700,000 florins. There was another debt inscribed, on account of Belgium, in the great book of the French empire, the interest of which amounted to 2,000,000 of florins, and this, too, was laid upon the new state. A further sum of 650,000 florins was added, in consideration of "the advantages of navigation and commerce which Holland is called upon to concede, and the sacrifices, of various kinds to which, on her side, the separation leads." The result was, that of 27,700,000 florins of interest, annually paid by the kingdom before the separation, and of which rather more than one-half had been raised in Belgium, she was in future to pay only 8,400,000.

The conditions now promulgated were to be inserted *verbatim* in a direct treaty between Holland and Belgium, which treaty would be placed under the formal guarantee of the five Powers. The Conference further declared that they were "the final and irrevocable decisions of the five Powers, who, of common accord, are resolved to bring about their full and entire acceptance by any party adverse to them;" and on their acceptance by Belgium, they were to have the force and effect of a solemn convention between the Belgian government and the Powers who were parties to the Conference. This was the very relation in which Holland had stood to them on the acceptance of the original articles; these, too, had been declared final and irrevocable; it was admitted that Holland's acceptance of them had bound the five Powers in engagements towards her; they were as able to compel their acceptance then as they were



now—with this difference that force would have been used, in the former instance, to do right, while it was to be used, in the present case to support injustice. When the question was, whether Belgium should be forced to obey their decrees, all compulsory measures were carefully avoided, and concession took their place. Now, when the question was, whether Holland should be forced to grant what they had pledged themselves they would not allow to be even demanded without her own voluntary consent, the envoy of Belgium was informed by the Conference that its members would take upon themselves the task of obtaining the acceptance of the articles by Holland, “even though she should begin with rejecting them.”

In the Belgian Congress these definitive articles were scarcely more favourably received than any of their predecessors; and, submissive as Leopold might be, he could not accede without legislative authority, for the constitution had included all the disputed territory as forming part of the state, and had declared that no cession or exchange of any part of it could be made without the sanction of the law. To give up the left bank of the Scheldt, part of Limburg, and part of Luxemburg, was sacrificing, in the opinions of the Belgians, their rights and their independence; nor were they less dissatisfied with the apportionment of the debt. Private motives were added to public considerations. The territory which Holland was to retain comprehended the property of various members of the Belgic legislature, who could not regard with pleasure the prospect of returning under the sway of their former master, of whom,

during their new career, they had in general been angry and violent opponents. Among them was Leopold's minister of war. In introducing a bill to authorize the sovereign to accept of the treaty, the foreign minister admitted that he was performing “a melancholy and painful duty,” but he counselled the passing of the bill as an unavoidable necessity, the five Powers having determined that it should be so, and not otherwise, and having closed the door against even remonstrance. The member, who had been Belgic envoy at London, stated, that when he asked lord Palmerston, whether, in the event of Belgium refusing the proffered terms, the five Powers would actually attack her, his lordship answered “not five, but six will.” Members were not wanting, however, still to advise resistance, maintaining that the European Powers would never risk a general war, and that beyond all doubt Belgium might reckon on France, whenever the question became one that was to be settled by arms. To diminish the chances of rousing popular excitement the discussion was conducted in a secret committee, but the war party immediately transmitted their speeches to the newspapers. After a strong discussion of several days, the representative body, on the 1st of November, accepted the proffered terms, by a majority of fifty-nine to thirty-eight votes. In the senate, out of forty-three members, only eight voted against them.

The Dutch government, on the other hand, refused either to depart, at the word of command, from the engagements which had been contracted in her favour, or to admit the right of the Conference to determine, without the participation of his majesty, mat-



ters which could only form the subject of negotiation between the five Powers and himself. He denied, as an independent monarch of an ancient and independent state, the title of the five Powers to dispose of the interests and territories of his subjects by treaties and discussions to which he was not admitted. Except in so far as the mere power successfully to perpetrate wrong could convert it into right, no departure from the obligations in which the Conference was bound to Holland could be effective, unless by negotiation with Holland herself. On these negotiations his majesty was ready to enter. He had given his plenipotentiaries the necessary powers and instructions for discussing with the Conference, how far the original terms might be varied or what modification of these new conditions might satisfy the acknowledged rights of Holland; but he would not submit to terms which, to a breach of faith, added the insult of dictating to him as an inferior, or the suppliant head of an un-recognized state.

The Conference refused to admit any negotiation; they demanded a simple adhesion to their articles—and referred to their declaration that these articles were irrevocable. The original fundamental bases had likewise been declared irrevocable; and just men laboured in vain to discover, how an irrevocable decree in favour of Belgium should be sacred, while an equally irrevocable decision in favour of Holland was treated as capable of being departed from to any extent at the pleasure of those who made it. When Holland accepted and Belgium refused, Belgium was admitted to negotiate, and to negotiate successfully, for alterations

unfavourable to Holland in the unchangeable decree. Now that Belgium accepted, and Holland refused, claiming, on infinitely stronger grounds, the same right, she was met with the stern answer that the Conference never admitted modifications on what it had declared to be irrevocable—which plainly was subject to this limitation—except in so far as the recalling of what is irrevocable shall be demanded by Belgium or her patron France. It was impossible to conceal, that the whole of these transactions, in which Holland met with so much harshness, bad faith, and positive injustice, and the extravagance, the impudence, and the pertinacity of Belgium, with so much indulgence, were negotiations turning upon this question—how far is it necessary to sacrifice Holland in order to prevent France from making herself mistress of Belgium?

Belgium having acceded to the terms proposed, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts concluded, on the 15th of November, a treaty with Leopold, recognizing him and his kingdom. It set forth at length the 24 definitive articles, and guaranteed to him the execution of them. The treaty was to be ratified, and the ratifications exchanged within two months. Against this treaty the Dutch plenipotentiaries protested; no progress was made in the direct treaty between Holland and Belgium, contemplated in the articles; and the state of possession remained undisturbed, the king of Holland having declared, that although he would not desist from his military armaments, he would employ them in the mean time, only for the purposes of defence.



## CHAP. XIII.

GERMANY.—*Insurrections in Hanover, at Osterode, and Gottingen—Accession of Duke William of Brunswick in place of his brother—Public movements in Hesse Cassel and Saxony.*—SWITZERLAND. *Insurrections and military operations in the Canton of Basle—The insurgents are put down—and again take arms—A federal army occupies the Canton—Insurrection in Schwyz.—Insurrection in Neufchatel—Changes in the other Cantons—Proceedings of the Diet.*—POLAND. *The Dictator attempts to negotiate—He resigns and a Committee of government is appointed—Polish Manifesto against Russia—The Throne of Poland declared vacant—Preparations for war—The Russian army approaches Warsaw—Battles in the neighbourhood of Warsaw—The Russians retire—The Poles attack and carry their positions—Defeat of the Poles in Volhynia and Podolia—The Russian army again advances and again retreats—The Poles assume the offensive—Battle of Ostrolenko—The Polish army falls back upon Warsaw—Operations in Volhynia—The Poles defeated in Lithuania—The Russians prepare to cross the Vistula—Dissensions in Warsaw—The Russians establish themselves on the left bank of the Vistula—Insurrections and outrages in Warsaw—The Committee of Government resigns, and a dictator is appointed—Progress of the Russians—Storming of the fortifications of Warsaw—Warsaw surrenders—Dispersion of the Polish army—Progress of the Cholera Morbus.*

**E**VEN in Germany the spirit of popular commotion, excited by the French revolution of 1830, did not pass away without stirring up some temporary agitation. Hanover, since its formation into a kingdom, had enjoyed a representative constitution; but it possessed, likewise, men who thought this constitution not sufficiently democratic, and had fallen in love with the system of barricades and national guards as the most efficient instruments of reform. On the 7th of January a band of these persons all at once assumed authority in the town of Osterode in the Harz. They issued a proclamation announcing that they had

already proceeded so far in forming a communal-guard, as to have elected its officers, and that their object in thus arming themselves and their fellow citizens was, to protect persons and property, while they proceeded to lay their grievances before the governor general of the kingdom. This newly created protection for persons and property was offered in a peaceful city, where neither the one nor the other was in any danger except from the movements of these persons themselves. The military commander of the district immediately entered the city with troops. Two of the ringleaders, both of them practitioners of the law, were



apprehended, and the commotion forthwith disappeared. But the same spirit had now shewn itself in Gottingen, if indeed, the partial insurrection at Osterode was not part of the same plot. On the 8th of January a band of citizens and students assembled in arms, headed by two men bearing the dignity of doctors of law. They marched to the town-house, dethroned the civic authorities, and compelled an obnoxious police-commissioner to resign his office. They, too, issued a proclamation declaring that they had thus formed themselves into a national guard to maintain public order, which they alone were violating and endangering, and that their only object was, to obtain from the king the convocation of what they called a free assembly of representatives elected by the people, and the establishment of a perfectly free constitution. They asserted that 2,000 citizens and 500 students had already been enrolled, and announced, with French brevity "The national guard is completely formed." A professor of the university was requested to take the command. He consented, in the hope of being able to detach the students from the townsmen; but finding this impracticable, and that the matter was likely to be more serious than he had imagined, he resigned the office in the course of next day, and the dignity was conferred on a young man, one of the private lecturers. On the 9th of January the rebels appointed a provisional government. Its members immediately issued another proclamation, expressing their hope that every commune throughout the kingdom would likewise form a national guard, and place it in communication with the armed in-

surgents of Gottingen. In this expectation they were disappointed. Nobody moved but themselves.

So soon as the government was informed of these disorders, it issued a proclamation, requiring all good subjects, and especially the students, to separate themselves from the disturbers of the public peace. A royal commissioner likewise was despatched to Gottingen, to accomplish this object, and to institute proceedings against the rebels. He was admitted into the city, and to an interview with the provisional government; but he had no authority to grant their demands, and they would listen to no other terms. They therefore declared that his powers to treat were too limited, and they even had the impudence to request him to use his influence to prevent military from being brought against the city. They answered, too, the royal proclamation with one of their own, in which they declared it a gross calumny to speak of them as disturbers of public order, for they had risen in arms only to prevent their rising in arms from producing confusion. Any separation among them, until they had gained their object, and any inquiry into their conduct in thus seeking to obtain it, was, they said, entirely out of the question; and any proceeding against their resolutions thus announced they would consider as using force—in which case they declared themselves free from all responsibility for the consequences which might then ensue. The government immediately issued orders to the professors to close their classes till after Easter. All students belonging to the kingdom were commanded forthwith to quit the city, under the penalty that, if they remained, they would be



for ever excluded from all public situations. All foreigners, likewise, attending the university were ordered to leave Gottingen. A motley deputation, consisting partly of the dethroned magistrates, partly of the members of the provisional government, and partly of students, proceeded to Hanover, where they were admitted to an audience. Their demands were, that the insurgents should be allowed to present a petition directly to the governor-general the duke of Cambridge; that his royal highness should visit Gottingen in person; and that the troops now advancing against the city should be recalled, as the national guard was determined to resist. His royal highness, doomed thus to hear open treason, answered that he would receive any petition proceeding from a constituted authority, and respectfully expressed; that he would come to Gottingen as soon as the national guard was disbanded, and the provisional government dissolved; and that the first of all conditions must be the quiet reception of the king's troops into the town. The insurgents continued in their blind obstinacy, apparently without perceiving that they were not joined by another human being. The only military in Gottingen were some eighty men of a jager-corps. The provisional government demanded their arms for the use of the citizens. The men refused, and marched out of the town, drums beating, and the royal colours flying, to meet the advancing army.

Every thing was ready for an attack; but the government still tried to avoid the necessity of overcoming by force a resistance, which could not but be useless, though it might be mischievous. The

great body of the citizens had taken no share in the tumult; but they were under the control of the armed and violent few, who, led by newly fledged doctors of law, and self-conceited advocates who had nothing else to do, seemed resolved to expose the city to the dangers of a forcible entry by the royal troops. They issued an address to the soldiery, warning them against attacking their fellow citizens, and informing them that whoever should dare to give them such an order was their bitterest enemy, and deserved the most signal punishment. They summoned, likewise, all the villages in the neighbourhood to send them men, provisions, and arms; but they called in vain: neither men, nor sausages, nor pitchforks appeared. They tried, likewise, to get some money into their hands, by calling on the citizens to pay them their taxes, "for," said they, "money is the vital principle of a state, and to refuse us money is to paralyse our efforts to form a better state." This was probably the work of some of the more crafty heads among them, who saw the near bursting of the bubble, and thought there would be no harm in robbing the exchequer, if they could first find one. The gates were secured with beams and waggons; the walls were manned, not only against the enemy, but to prevent the town's-people from departing. It was even proposed to pour scalding oil on the troops as they entered, and to set, if not the city, at least the university buildings, on fire. But all this violent and wordy opposition terminated in nothing. The troops drew nearer and nearer. Their commander general Busche sent the insurgents notice, on the 15th of January,



that he allowed them twelve hours to lay down their arms, and admit his army. At the expiration of that time, he would attack. The citizens exclaimed loudly against the ruin to which these hot-heads were exposing them. The members of the provisional government quarrelled among themselves. One after another forsook his post in the city; the national guard dissolved almost unobserved; the former magistrates resumed their authority; and, next day, the gates were thrown open to the royal troops.

The duke of Brunswick who had brought himself under the ban of the Germanic diet, and had subsequently been compelled, by his own subjects, to flee from his states, was, in the course of the year, formally dethroned. The Diet, on the 2nd of December 1830, had authorized his younger brother, duke William, to assume the government in the mean time, and had referred it to the princes related to the House of Brunswick, to decide on the best mode of finally arranging the affairs of the duchy. But this was not an easy task. The king of Hanover could not help being convinced, by notorious facts, that duke Charles was absolutely incapable of holding the reins of government, and duke William, notwithstanding his love for his brother, could not avoid coming to the same conclusion. They wished, however, to be spared the necessity of openly proclaiming this incapacity of their relation, but all attempts having failed it was now found necessary to declare that the government of the duchy of Brunswick was vacant, and to give it to duke William as the nearest in the order of succession. His highness accordingly

assumed the government, and fixed the 25th of April for taking the oath of allegiance to him, to which his subjects, happy in the change, willingly consented.

In Hesse Cassel, notwithstanding the changes which the elector introduced into the political institutions of the country, partial disturbances took place, occasioned in a great measure, as it appeared, by dislike of the personal character and conduct of the ruling prince; and his royal highness consented, in the month of October, to admit his eldest son and heir apparent, to a share in the government, by assuming him as co-regent of the electorate.—Royal Saxony, too, was not without its clubs and agitations, and the king and the prince co-regent promised the speedy promulgation of an altered constitution, and of a law to allow the redemption of feudal rights; and the king of Denmark, as duke of Holstein, announced the general outline of new and liberal institutions for his states.

In Switzerland, in the end of the preceding year, some of the country communes of the canton of Basle had insisted that, instead of being the subjects of the capital, they should be placed on the same footing with its citizens, enjoying an equal share in the representation, and in the composition of the councils. These demands being refused, the country people rose in arms to enforce them. They established a provisional government at Liechstatt, and marched against Basle, which they threatened with a siege. The citizens, among whom they found no friends, prepared for war, while deputies were sent to the insurgents, but in vain, to prevail on them to.



return to their duty. The army of the city then marched out to attack them, and gained decisive successes over them, in the middle of January. The armed bands of the insurgents were dispersed; Liechstatt itself was occupied, almost without resistance; the provisional government was dissolved, and the authority of that of the Canton seemed to be restored. Two of the leaders of the rebellion were pardoned at the request of the diet; but all the other most active agitators had sought refuge in the neighbouring cantons from which they carried on their intrigues to renew disturbances, and to prevail on the government to espouse their cause. Basle complained loudly, that the neighbouring canton of Soleure, gave them almost open encouragement and assistance to revive the insurrection. It broke out anew in the middle of August, at Liechstatt, Tissach, and Waldenburgh, all of them places in the same district of the Canton, and that district conterminous with Soleure. The government of Basle was declared to be no longer recognized; and a provisional one was again established. The troops of the capital again marched against Liechstatt on the 21st of August. The insurgents refused to surrender; the town was attacked; the regular troops succeeded in entering, and pulling down the tree of liberty which had been planted, but being exposed to a fire from the windows of the houses, and recesses of the streets, they again retired. Intelligence of these renewed disorders had reached Lucerne on the 21st of August. The federal diet immediately met, and, after expressing its most decided detestation of the renewal of anarchy, resolved to

send four deputies to Basle, with orders to the insurgents to lay down their arms, and return to their duty, desiring, at the same time, that the government should cease from the effusion of blood and every hostile measure. The negotiations of these deputies failed to restore order. The insurgents insisted on remaining in arms against the government of the canton, and, being too weak to make any impression on the city, directed their operations against the country communes which remained faithful to the capital. These the capital was bound to defend and support, and thus a great portion of that quiet and industrious canton was given up to outrage and anarchy. The diet at last marched a federal army into the canton, to maintain peace, while negotiations should proceed under the mediation of federal deputies.

The Mountain Shepherds of the canton of Schwyz were involved in similar scenes. There, too, what are called the exterior districts demanded to be put on a level, in the government of the canton, with the capital and the original districts. They collected in arms near Ensiedlen. The diet recommended to the cantonal government to comply with some of the demands of the insurgents; but the Landsgemeinde of Schwyz, a pure democracy, (for this very meeting consisted of more than 2000 men) with one voice, rejected the recommendations of the diet, declaring that they would know how to repel with force any attempt to prevent them from using force to reduce to obedience their rebellious subjects. The latter, however, did not bring the quarrel the length of actual collision,



The flame next reached the canton of Neufchatel. Here the people had no pretext of not enjoying a sufficiently free constitution; but, then, though they lived under what was the next thing to a democracy, they were subject to the nominal sovereignty of the king of Prussia, who, by right of descent, is prince of Neufchatel and Valengin. A plot was formed to get up what was called an emancipation revolution. The conspirators were found only in some of the thickly-peopled vallies of the Jura, and the whole scheme came across the frontier from France. On the morning of the 13th of September, the town of Neufchatel was frightened from its repose, by the intelligence that an army of rebels was advancing. The city guard was called to arms, but the members of the government, unwilling to occasion immediate bloodshed, withdrew to Valengin, while the insurgents occupied Neufchatel and its castle with a force of 700 or 800 men. On the other hand, the faithful districts immediately supplied an army nearly equal in numbers, which took post at Valengin for the protection of the government. The latter convoked the legislative body, which, on the 19th of September, declared its sittings permanent, "not to make laws, but to restore order and tranquillity." The intervention of the diet was, at the same time, demanded. The mediators forthwith appeared on the spot; the castle was occupied by a garrison of federal troops, detachments of which were likewise marched into some of the vallies which had sent forth the insurgents. A royal commissioner, having arrived from Berlin, informed the diet and the legislative body of the intentions

of the king of Prussia. He would not consent to any discussion of the question of the sovereignty of his master, which, worthless as it might be, was not to be wrested from him by force. His majesty was desirous that the people of Neufchatel should enjoy every freedom compatible with good order; and his sovereignty had never stood in their way. He would consent to any changes that were really useful, such as the immediate renewal of the council of state, if this body had lost the public confidence, a free discussion of the budget, and the right of voting for the civil list. The king was even willing, if required, to sacrifice the revenue he derived from the principality; but his majesty could not, without making himself liable to the imputation of cowardice, entirely relinquish the sovereignty of Neufchatel, and it was the more out of his power to make so great a concession, as it would appear that he had been forced to it by the capture of the castle by the insurgents. Divided as parties were, to put the question to a vote in the legislative assembly would only plunge the country into anarchy and civil war. The king was about to claim the intervention of the diet to bring back the country to obedience to its legitimate government; and, if the diet refused to perform this duty, his majesty was resolved to submit the question of Neufchatel to the conference at London. The diet was too much perplexed to come to a speedy decision; and in the mean time, the insurgents threatened a new attack upon the capital, where all was now prepared for resistance, both the civic guard, and the federal army of occupation being constantly under arms. All



that the country had as yet gained by this foolish miniature revolution, the very first step of which had been to march in arms against a peaceful city, without even previous complaint or remonstrance, was the burthen of supporting the troops sent by their neighbours to maintain that tranquillity which they were not able to preserve among themselves.

In the Cantons of Berne, Lucerne, and the Pays de Vaud, the alterations which were demanded in the existing constitutions were conceded without the occurrence of any scenes of similar violence. In all of them, the object of these alterations was, to deprive the existing institutions of aristocratical tendencies which they were thought to possess, and to place a larger share of power directly in the hands of the great mass of the people; commissioners were named to frame the new political regulations, which were then laid before primary assemblies of the people for their approbation and sanction.

The spirit of change did not limit its innovations to the constitution of the particular diets. It affected likewise the federal government itself. The reformers of Switzerland demanded, that the citizens of each canton should have a full liberty of trade within the territories of every other, that every Swiss should be at liberty to establish himself in whatever canton he might think proper, and that the representation in the diet should be in proportion to the extent or population of each canton. These claims were resisted by the diet, which was thus exposed to unpopularity, while it was perplexed with quarrels and insurrections in particular cantons. It thought proper likewise to alarm

itself with the apprehensions of foreign war. The movement of Austrian troops to put down the insurrections in Lombardy seemed to have filled them with a suspicion that their territory might be violated. The diet addressed a note on this subject to each of the great Powers, and received from all of them the same assurance, that no state entertained the most distant design of interfering with their neutrality. They proceeded however to make warlike preparations; their whole military force was put into a disposable condition, though not actually called out; and some of the most difficult parts of the passage of the Simplon were fortified.

This year saw the insurrection of Poland against the domination of Russia brought to a close. The heads of the insurrection had not at first declared any intention to throw off all subjection to the Russian autocrat: they had only demanded the preservation of the national rights, and the independence of the separate constitution, under the sovereignty of the emperor, which had been guaranteed to them, as they averred, by the Congress of Vienna. The emperor, however, would not treat with armed rebels: he demanded unconditional submission before he would consider their complaints, and prepared to maintain his supremacy by his armies. Poland, likewise, armed herself for the contest, and now formally expelled the dynasty of the czar. The two Chambers of the diet, having assembled at Warsaw on the 18th of December, continued Chlopicki in his office of dictator, which he was to retain until he should himself resign it, or until the diet should elect another commander-in-chief. Chlopicki again attempted negoci-



ations, repeating the declaration that Poland wished only "a reasonable liberty," and "that the nation was very far from the thought of dissolving the ties which bound it to his majesty." He added that he had consented to assume the executive authority, to prevent it from falling into the hands of turbulent and dangerous men and to put a stop to anarchy, which already, within a few days, had overturned three different governments—and to supply more efficiently the place of the diet, which, notwithstanding the talent and popularity of its members, was too exaggerated in its decisions, and yet too weak to restore or maintain public order. The emperor approved highly of these sentiments, but insisted on obedience to the terms of his proclamations. The attempt to negotiate was not received by the diet with approbation; they particularly disliked the language which the dictator had used in speaking of their own body; and one member proposed that the dictator should be declared a traitor—as if on purpose to justify the description which Chlopicki had given of their "exaggerated decisions." They resolved, however, to elect a new commander-in-chief. The choice fell on prince Radzivill, and the dictator, thereupon resigning his power, returned to the ranks of the army. The executive authority was then committed to five persons named by the Chambers of the diet, of whom prince Adam Czar-torisky was appointed president.

As there no longer remained any alternative but war or unconditional submission, the diet put forth a manifesto stating the grounds on which it had engaged in the contest, and justified the in-

urrection. The Congress of Vienna, they said, impressed with the necessity, as well as justice, of repairing some part of the wrongs which Poland had suffered from unjust partitions, had stipulated that Poland should form a kingdom under the sovereignty of the Russian autocrat, with a separate charter and constitution, reciprocal freedom of commerce, and a recognized nationality; and, at the same time, the hope had been held out that to the new kingdom might be added those Polish provinces which were still retained as proper Russian dominions. The emperor Alexander accordingly had granted a constitution to the kingdom; but it was soon discovered that it was never intended it should receive effect. The Russian government soon saw that Poland must either be kept under the same iron despotism with its other dominions, or would itself infect them with liberal institutions, and Alexander became, instead of the defender, the persecutor of the rights of Poland. "Russia lost all hope of ever seeing the yoke by which she was oppressed taken off by the hand of her sovereign, and Poland saw herself successively deprived of all her privileges. No time was lost in carrying this design into execution. Public education was corrupted, a system of concealment and mystery was adopted, the people were left without means of instruction, a whole palatinate was deprived of its representation, and the Chambers were no longer allowed the faculty of voting the supplies. New burthens were imposed, new monopolies created to dry up the sources of national wealth; and the treasury, enriched by these measures, became the pasture of salaried sycophants, infamous hireling insti-



gators, and vile and despicable spies. Instead of the economy so repeatedly called for, pensions were augmented in a most scandalous degree, to which were added enormous gratuities, and offices created solely with the view of augmenting the number of the government satraps. Individual liberty, which had been solemnly guaranteed, was violated, and the prisons of the state became crowded; councils of war were authorized to pronounce judgment in civil cases; and citizens, whose only fault was a wish to save the spirit and character of the nation from corruption, were subjected to infamous punishments. It was in vain that some of the authorities of the kingdom, and the representatives of the people, laid before the king a faithful picture of the abuses committed in his name, for not only were the abuses suffered to remain unsuppressed, but the responsibility of the ministers and the administrative authorities was paralysed, by the immediate interference of the brother of the emperor, and by the exercise of that discretionary power with which he was invested."

Nor had the treatment experienced by the Polish provinces incorporated with Russia been less faithless and tyrannical. Instead of being re-united to the kingdom, and admitted to the enjoyment of the liberal institutions stipulated by the Congress of Vienna, the national recollections awakened in them, first by promises and encouragement, and then by a long expectation, became a crime against the state, and the king of Poland caused to be prosecuted, in the ancient provinces of that state, such Poles as had dared to call themselves Poles. The youth of the schools were particularly the

objects of persecution; the issue of the first families were transported to Siberia, or were forced to enter into the ranks of a corrupt soldiery. In official documents and judicial examinations, the Polish language was suppressed; the Polish tribunals and civil law were annihilated by ukases; abuses of administration reduced the landed proprietors to misery; and since the accession of Nicholas to the throne, this state of things had constantly been growing worse. Religious intolerance itself employed every means to consolidate the united Greek ritual upon the ruins of the catholic ritual. In the kingdom itself, the very constitution which had been granted was violently infringed in 1825, by the emperor annihilating the publicity of the proceedings of the diet, thus asserting the principle that he might abolish at his pleasure any provision of the charter. The insurrection at St. Petersburg on the death of Alexander, and the accession of Nicholas only brought fresh and more unwarrantable exercises of despotic power. The most distinguished members of the diet, of the army, of the citizens, were arbitrarily deprived of their liberty. In contempt of every law, a special committee of inquiry was instituted, composed of Russians and Poles, most of them military men, who, by protracted tortures, by promises of pardon, and insidious questions, only sought to extort from the accused the confession of an imaginary crime. It was only after an imprisonment of one year and a half, that the high national court was established. The accused, who had been groaning in prison for two years, were acquitted of any crime against the state; yet, instead of



being set at liberty, they were conveyed to St. Petersburg, where they were imprisoned in forts, and up to this moment several had not been restored to their families. The publication and execution of the sentence was stopped. It was submitted to the examination of the executive authorities, and when, at length, out of some regard for Europe, it was found necessary to publish it, a minister carried his audacity so far as to degrade the national majesty, by reprimanding, in the name of the sovereign, the highest magistracy of the state, in the exercise of their most exalted functions. At the same time, all hope was destroyed of seeing the other provinces incorporated with the kingdom. From that moment, dislike of the Russian yoke, and a determination to throw it off, on the first favourable opportunity, had been rapidly spreading. The French revolution of July took place, followed by the insurrection of Belgium and of the Italian states. "In consequence of reports daily corroborated, of a war against the liberty of nations, orders were given to put upon the war establishment the Polish army destined to march; and, in its place, the Russian armies were to occupy the country. Considerable sums, proceeding from loans and the sale of the national domains, deposited at the bank, were to cover the expenses of this deadly war against liberty. Arrests again took place: every moment was precious. Our army, our treasure, our resources, our national honour, averse to rivet chains upon the necks of other nations, and to fight against liberty and our former companions in arms, were at stake. Every one shared this feeling; but

the heart of the nation, the focus of enthusiasm, the youth of the army and of the colleges, as well as a great part of the garrison of Warsaw, and of the citizens, impressed with this sentiment, resolved to give the signal for insurrection. An electric spark in a moment inflamed the army, the capital, and the whole country. In one day the capital was delivered: in a few days all the divingenerosity of the Poles, and owing sions of the army were united by the same sentiment, the fortresses occupied, the natives armed, the brother of the emperor, was dismissed with the Russian troops, relying upon the his safety to this step alone." On these grounds they had taken up arms, which they declared they would never lay down, till they had not only secured their liberties as an independent kingdom, but had likewise conquered the freedom of the Polish provinces already incorporated with Russia. This manifesto was followed up, on the 25th of January, by a decree of the diet, declaring the throne of Poland vacant, thus rejecting even that sovereignty of the emperor, as over a state separate from Russia, which had been recognized by the Congress of Vienna.

Unequal as the struggle threatened to be, the Poles had the advantage of being already prepared with an army rendered extremely effective by the careful military organization of the very power to which it was to be opposed. Great exertions were used in training and arming the people, both that they might be formed into regular troops, and be effective as a levy *en masse*. The Polish army already in the field was stated to consist of 30,000 infantry and 6,000 cavalry. A na-



tional guard was formed for the maintenance of order in Warsaw. The Jews were admitted to its ranks, but only on condition of shaving off their beards. The greatest drawback on the part of the Poles, lay in the narrow circle to which the insurrection was confined. Apprehension of the overwhelming power of Russia prevented it from extending with any marked or continued effect, into the surrounding provinces. In those parts of Poland which belonged to Austria and Prussia every thing remained quiet; nor could the government even attempt to rouse them, because such a step would have driven these two Powers to make common cause with Russia. On the other hand, Poland was assured that these powerful neighbours would not interfere against her, and she probably expected as much good from the aid of the free states of Europe as from her own exertions. The marshal of the diet told the Chamber of representatives, on the 19th of January, "The constitutional states of Europe wait only for our declaring Poland independent. Ere long troops will come from the banks of the Thames and the Seine."

The Russian emperor, in the mean time, determined to put down the insurrection by force, had hastened forward his troops to support his proclamations. The main army had been assembled, during the month of January, in the government of Grodno, immediately to the north of Warsaw, ready to advance at once against the capital, and the main body of the Polish forces. It was commanded by marshal Diebitsch, the surmounter of the Balkan, and the conqueror of Turkey. Along

with him was the arch-duke Constantine, whose violent and cruel personal character had borne no small share in producing this revolution against his family. Another division of the Russians, under the orders of generals Geismar and Kreuz, crossing the Bug in another direction, advanced against Lublin and Zamosc, to the south of Warsaw. Their movements were watched by a Polish corps under general Dwernicki. The main Polish army, commanded by prince Radzivill, was stationed to the northward of Warsaw, between that capital and Grodno, the Russian-head quarters. Warsaw itself, and Praga, its suburb on the right bank of the Vistula, had been hastily fortified.

On the 5th, 6th, and 7th of February, the Russian army entered the kingdom, at different points along a large extent of frontier. As they advanced, converging towards Warsaw, the Poles, wisely declining a general engagement, withdrew from their posts, and fell back towards the capital. Their plan seemed to be, in that position to keep the enemy at bay, till the flooding of the country, on the breaking up of the ice on the Vistula, the Bug, and their tributary rivers, should impede his communications, endanger his supplies, and render difficult the movements of his heavy troops and artillery. Although, therefore, some skirmishing took place, and isolated posts which had been abandoned were sometimes recovered by the Poles, Diebitsch encountered no serious resistance in crossing the Bug, and approaching Warsaw. In these occasional rencontres the Polish soldiers displayed no want of courage, or their officers, of skill. The diet, in the



mean time declared, that the invasion was no sufficient reason for discontinuing its sittings, and spent days in long discussion in settling the form of oath by which fidelity was to be sworn to the new institutions. As the Russians approached, the Polish forces concentrated themselves in advance of Praga; and Warsaw, on the 19th of February, was declared by the government to be in a state of siege. On the same day the Russians, having reached Grochow, within a short distance of the capital, came at last upon the Polish positions, and a furious combat followed. It raged during the whole day; many men were sacrificed; but the Russians failed to secure any advantage. Next morning they renewed the attack in two divisions, one commanded by general Rosen, the other by count Pahlen. In the early part of the day the advantage was on the side of the Poles. According to the admission of the Russian commander himself, count Pahlen, instead of being able to make any impression on the enemy, was obliged to retreat. New troops, however, being brought up, and a formidable artillery brought into play, the battle was restored. The Poles, with devoted bravery, contested every inch of the ground, and strained every nerve to drive the Russians from the woods in which they sought shelter from the cavalry. Night alone put an end to the contest. The Russians claimed the victory on the ground that they were somewhat nearer Warsaw than they had been in the morning. But between them and the capital still stood the Polish army, firm and undefeated; and the best proof of Diebitsch having gained no decisive advantage, was

found in the fact that, for the three following days, he was unable to act as the aggressor, but remained repairing his losses, and collecting re-inforcements for a new attack. He admitted a loss of 2,000 men, killed and wounded, in the battle of the 20th alone, among whom were several generals.

The Russian commander having been joined by strong reinforcements, resumed operations on the 24th, and carried a village on the left of the Polish position. On the morning of the 25th, he made a more general and vigorous attack, directing, in the first place, all his force against a wood which was occupied by the Poles, in front of Praga. After a murderous combat of two hours, during which the Poles lost one of their generals, the Russians, supported by an overwhelming artillery, made good their point. Chlopicki the ex-dictator, and general Skrzynecki, rallying the troops, advanced to retake the wood. Amid a murderous fire they made themselves masters of part of it. The Russians, too, renewed their efforts. A fresh reserve was brought up; new batteries were erected, and the Poles were finally obliged to abandon this important post. On the other points, they had been more successful in repelling the attacks of the Russians; but the Polish commander now retired, in good order, under the fortifications of Praga. There, too, before day closed, the enemy again attacked him, but were repulsed with great loss. The Poles, however, quitted Praga, and crossing the Vistula, entered Warsaw, still occupying the tête du pont beyond the river. The commander attributed this movement to the danger of the approaching breaking up of the



ice on the Vistula carrying away the bridge, and thus cutting off his communication with the city. Part of the suburb was ordered to be destroyed to give room for the fire from the fortifications of the city.

In these engagements the Poles, according to their own statements, had lost 9000 men in killed and wounded. The loss of the Russians certainly was not smaller; and although they had now placed themselves in a situation to attack Warsaw itself, they seemed to have suffered too severely to attempt at once so serious an operation, and had learned with what vigour they were likely to be resisted. If it was the intention of Diebitsch to carry Warsaw by a sort of coup-de-main, his plan had failed. Though he might still carry Praga, the Poles had only to burn, or cut away the bridge of boats to separate him from Warsaw. He found himself compelled to remain inactive, awaiting reinforcements, and preparing means for crossing the Vistula. The main body of the army was drawn back towards Plozk, to be joined by the new troops hastening forward from Russia. Strong divisions however were left in front of Warsaw, to coop up the Poles, and watch their operations. One of them, under general Geismar was stationed at Wawer, and another under general Rosen, at Dembiewilkie, both of them to the eastward of Praga and Warsaw on the road to Minsk. A more advanced corps observed Praga itself. The division, too, under general Kreuz, which had crossed the Vistula, to the south of Warsaw, in the hope of distracting the attention, and drawing off part of the forces of the Poles, after suffering some repulses from

the Polish corps under general Dwernicki, was recalled to the right bank of the river, lest, by the expected thaw, it should be altogether cut off from the main army. The melting of the ice which soon ensued, and the consequent inundations of the Vistula, rendered extensive operations impossible, so that the month of March passed in inaction, with the exception of occasional and unimportant skirmishing in the neighbourhood of Praga.

After the battle of the 25th of February, Prince Radzivill had resigned the chief command of the army in favour of General Skrzynecki who had displayed great courage and conduct in that conflict and in the engagements which preceded it. The general endeavoured to open negotiations with Diebitsch, but they failed in consequence of the latter adhering to his master's demand of unconditional submission. The Polish commander, therefore, having employed the respite allowed him by the forced inactivity of the Russians in recruiting his troops and renewing his *materiel*, resolved to assume the offensive, by attacking unexpectedly the scattered cantonments of the enemy, who seem to have been unprepared for such vigorous operations. On the night of the 30th of March, he led 25,000 men from Warsaw, through Praga, to assault general Geismar at Wawer. The road was covered with straw, so that the artillery and cavalry, aided, too, by the darkness of the night, advanced without being perceived. The advanced guard, under Geismar, consisting of eight or ten thousand men, was surprised at Wawer: its entrenchments were stormed, and it was forced to fall back, by a precipitate retreat, on the



stronger force of general Rosen, posted at Dembe-Wielkie. The Poles pressed on: attacked them again, and after a struggle which lasted from five in the afternoon till ten at night, carried the position of General Rosen, and compelled him to a hasty flight. The loss of the Russians was estimated at 5000 men by the Poles, who likewise claimed, 6000 prisoners, two standards, and fifteen pieces of cannon, besides a number of ammunition waggons. The cannon were carried to Warsaw, covered with green boughs, amid the acclamations of the people. General Rosen abandoned Minsk, and fell back upon the reserve, the Poles still moving northwards after him, and, throwing bodies of their troops across the Bug, approaching the position of Marshal Diebitsch himself.

These brilliant exploits were accompanied by a partial insurrection in Lithuania, particularly in the government of Wilna. At the head of it were some of the nobility; but the presence of Russian troops at every point, prevented it from spreading, and the severest measures were adopted to repress it.

After the victories of March, general Sierawski had been dispatched to aid Dwernicki in the south, for the purpose of raising an insurrection in Volhynia. At first their operations were successful. They cleared the right bank of the Vistula of the enemy, and Dwernicki even crossed the Bug. But they advanced too incautiously and acted too far asunder. On the 17th of April, Sierawski fell in with the much more numerous Russian corps of General Kreuz. Instead of making a timely retreat, he persisted in pressing on during the whole day an unequal combat.

He was, however, at last compelled to retreat to Razimierz, where on the following day he was again attacked, and found himself under the necessity of repassing the Vistula, with a loss of 1,200 men killed; among whom were two Lieutenant-Colonels. The fate of Dwernicki was still more disastrous. His successful career was stopped, on the 20th of April by the Russian general Rudiger, who, having brought him to action, compelled him to commence a retrograde movement, while the defeat of Sierawski, setting free the troops which had been opposed to the latter, cut off the retreating army from the Vistula and Warsaw. The Polish general directed his march towards Podolia, keeping close to the Austrian frontiers, while Rudiger followed, and the Russian troops were closing round him. On the 29th of April, they were prepared to attack him at all points, when, instead of risking an engagement, he sought refuge in the Austrian territory, where his troops were disarmed, and removed from the frontier, by the Austrian authorities, as their neutrality required.

As the annihilation of this corps left the forces of Rudiger and Kreuz at liberty to support the operations of the main army, general Chrzanowski was immediately dispatched by the Polish commander towards Volhynia, at the head of 8000 men, to supply the place of Dwernicki and Sierawski. Chrzanowski approached the Russians by forced marches, carried some of their posts, and, on the 6th and 8th of May, gained advantages over detached divisions of their troops, which left in his hands a considerable number of prisoners. The Russians, how-



ever, having concentrated their forces compelled him to retreat, and attacked him, on the 9th at Lubartow, from which, after an obstinate resistance, the Poles were driven, with the loss of some of their ammunition, and 600 prisoners. They fled across the Wieprz, and found refuge in Old Zamosc.

Towards the north, in the mean time, where the main armies were stationed, no general engagement took place, though there was some severe fighting between detached corps, taking and retaking particular towns; the Poles generally claimed the advantage, though these contests had little influence on the result of the campaign. Diebitsch having completed his preparations, and received his reinforcements, again moved in advance towards Warsaw, and the Polish army gradually retired. On the 28th of April the Russian head-quarters were again at Minsk, where the Poles intended to make a stand, but they found it prudent to retire before the superior numbers of the enemy. They avoided a general battle, and immediately saw the Russians, in their turn, retire. The country was so exhausted, the Poles having destroyed or carried off in their retreat every thing which could be useful to the enemy, that Diebitsch, unable to procure even straw for his horses, was compelled to retire from Minsk, almost as soon as he had reached it, to his former position behind Siedlec. The Polish army again followed him, and resumed, in the end of April and beginning of May, their former positions in front of him. After some days spent in unimportant skirmishing, the Polish general began a series of movements against

the right wing of the Russian army, whose head quarters were at Ostrolenka, on the left bank of the Narew. The object which he afterwards declared he had in view in this movement was, to obtain the opportunity, by forcing back the Russian right wing, of throwing a body of troops into Lithuania, who might concentrate and organize the partial insurrection which had broken out in that ancient province of Poland, and thus place a hostile force in the enemy's rear. At the same time he might hope that, if the right wing were driven back, the rest of the Russian army would be compelled to a retrograde movement in order to maintain its communications. The dangers were, that Warsaw was left uncovered, that the Poles, by advancing too far, might be exposed to an attack from the greatly superior numbers of the whole Russian army; and that, in case of a reverse, the corps, which might be thrown into Lithuania, would be cut off from all support. The movements of the Poles were at first unsuccessful. Taking their march along the right bank of the Narew, they advanced from Sierock to Pultusk, on the same side of the river, without encountering much serious opposition. On the 18th they crossed the Narew at, and carried Ostrolenka, the Russian troops, though among them were the flower of the imperial guards, abandoning the fortifications which they had raised, avoiding a battle, and falling back in the direction of Bialystock. On the 20th, a division of the Polish army still pushing forward, made themselves masters of Lomza; while the commander-in-chief himself advanced on the road of Tykocin to cut off the retreat of the



Russian column by which Lomza had been abandoned. In this object he failed ; but, on the 21st he assaulted Tykocin itself. The Russians, aided by the difficulty of approaching the place, maintained it during the day, but evacuated it in the course of the following night. Their whole right wing had now been driven so far back, that the road to Lithuania was open, and a corps of the Polish army, under the command of general Chlapowski, marched into that province. At the same time, marshal Diebitsch, who had hitherto remained, with the main body of the army, on the south of the Bug, re-crossed that river, putting himself, by this retrograde movement in immediate connection with his right wing. Thus the whole kingdom of Poland was once more cleared of the enemy.

But it appeared as if it had been the plan of the Russian commander to allow the Poles to advance, while even his retrograde movements concentrated his troops, that he might attack them with his whole army. On the 21st of May he had re-crossed the Bug, and next day his whole army was in full march against the Poles, who immediately began a retreat. On the 23rd, their rear guard, commanded by general Lubinski was nearly surrounded ; but it cut its way through the Russian columns and rejoined the army. At the same time the advance of the right wing from Tykocin, had cut off the corps of general Gielgud. Weakened by this separation, as well as by having sent a corps into Lithuania, and being now exposed to the overwhelming numbers of the whole Russian army, Skrzynecki retreated to Ostrolenka where he intended to re-cross to the right

bank of the Narew. On the evening of the 25th of May, the greater part of his army had crossed in safety ; but the rear guard was attacked by the Russians, on the morning of the 26th. They were unable to maintain Ostrolenka, which was set in flames by the Russian artillery. Under the fire of the Russians, they passed the river, and joined the rest of the army, but they had time neither entirely to destroy the bridge, nor to prevent the Russians from repairing its partial injuries. Some divisions of the latter immediately crossed, covered by the fire of batteries on the left bank. The Poles, who had formed to receive them, now attacked, to prevent them from gaining a firm footing on their side of the river. The contest was long, obstinate, and murderous, the Russians making constant exertions to bring over fresh masses, and the Poles striving no less anxiously to regain the bridge, the undisturbed possession of which by the enemy, for bringing over his army, would have been their ruin. Night put an end to the combat. At its termination, the Russians maintained the bridge, and had their posts on the farther side, though the main body of their army still continued on the left bank. The Polish commander, however, claimed the victory, as he had not been driven from the position which he occupied when the Russians first began to pass the river ; but in the course of the following day, he continued his retreat undisturbed to Pultusk, and thence to Praga, the Polish army being thus once more drawn back for the defence of the capital. The Poles admitted a loss in the battle of nearly 5,000 men killed, among whom were thirty staff



officers and 225 of inferior grades. Two of their generals were also killed. The loss of the Russians was not supposed to have been smaller. This was the last of the battles of field-marshal Diebitsch. On the 10th of June, he was suddenly cut off by an attack of the Cholera, which not long before had commenced its ravages in Europe, and had already cut off numbers of men both in the Russian and Polish armies, whose movements again extended its effects wider and wider. On the marshal's death, Count Paskewitsch, the humiliator of Persia, was appointed to succeed him as commander-in-chief.

During the greater part of June, the active operations of the main armies were suspended. The Polish commander remained in the neighbourhood of Warsaw, apparently awaiting the result of the efforts which had been made to stir up insurrection in the neighbouring provinces. In Podolia and Kiew there were partial movements: small bodies of the insurgents sometimes captured detached posts, or overpowered a few men; but they were utterly unable to keep the field against the Russians, and the popular commotion failed to become general. In Volhynia, general Rudiger, after the defeat of Dwernicki, had again approached the Vistula. A strong corps was detached against him under the command of the Polish general Tankowski, while Chrzanowski, proceeding from Zamosc, was to throw himself in his rear. The Russian general would thus be surrounded by troops greatly superior, and the Poles counted on the annihilation of his army. Rudiger, however, instead of waiting the united attack, suddenly made his appearance before Jankowsky, at-

tacked him, and compelled him to retreat, with the loss of some prisoners and artillery. He then marched to Lublin, which Chrzanowski had reached in the execution of his part of the design, recovered the town, and compelled the Polish general to return to the left bank of the Vistula.

In Lithuania, the encouragement of an insurrection, in which had occasioned the battle of Ostrolenka, the two corps of Chlapowski and Gielgud were now completely separated from Poland, by the results of the battle, and the position of the Russian army. The former of these commanders, immediately after leaving the main army, marched towards Bialystock; and, on the 26th of May, routed at Narewka a body of Russians who opposed his advance. He put to death four peasants of the province, subjects of Russia, who had acted as guides to the Russian troops and these murders were perpetrated under the pretext that the victims were "four degenerated inhabitants of the country." He then proceeded to Minsk, and, being joined by Gielgud, who had encountered, in his march, no serious opposition, they advanced together against Wilna, round which the Russian forces, intended to act against them, had been assembling under the command of general Sacken. The Russians had not sought seriously to stop them, apparently willing that they should be drawn forward to a point where defeat would be ruin. The Polish generals attacked, with their combined forces, the positions of the enemy at Wilna. They were repulsed, were attacked in their turn, and driven across the river Wilna in such haste, that they were unable to destroy the bridge.



General Sacken pursued, increasing the confusion of their flight, and rendering it hopeless by cutting them off from the road southward into Poland. They fled towards the Prussian frontier. The Russians overtook them at Kovno, a frontier town. There they attempted to rally, but were driven from it, and forced into Prussia, where they were disarmed. General Gielgud was shot by one of his own officers. The body which was thus dispersed did not amount to 3,000 men. Another division of nearly equal numbers, instead of entering Prussia, to be disarmed, preferred attempting to manœuvre and fight its way back to Warsaw. It was commanded by general Dembienski. His bold attempt was aided by the circumstance of the main Russian army having by that time moved westward from the Narew to cross the Vistula below Warsaw. He conducted it likewise with great skill and intrepidity; and, on the 2nd of August, he brought his corps and his cannon, amid the acclamations of the populace, safely into Warsaw, under whose walls the struggle was now to be terminated. The Poles called Gielgud a traitor; but the truth was, they had sent men where they were cut off from all resources, in blind confidence in an insurrection which they were unable to organize. The troops of Gielgud and Chlapowski might have been useful at Ostrolenka; the loss of the latter sealed their ruin.

Count Paskewitsch had arrived at the army in the last days of June, and lost no time in resuming active operations. He departed from the plan of his predecessor, who had approached Warsaw from the right bank of the Vistula. On that side the strongly fortified sub-

urb of Praga had first to be carried. Even when it should be carried, yet, as the bridge could easily be destroyed, the river would still remain between the capital and the invading force, and the latter would have to pass it under the fire of the city. The new commander resolved to cross the Vistula further down the river, and having thus gained more easily the bank on which Warsaw stood, to attack the city from the westward, where no deep and rapid river would intervene. On the 7th of July his army broke up from Pultusk and Prassnitz, and moved in three divisions towards the Vistula. Plock was selected as the principal point of passage. A bridge was constructed, and the army carried across without any attempt at opposition. The Polish general had indeed moved from Warsaw, but he did not move to dispute the passage of the Vistula. He marched along the Narew, into the neighbourhood which the Russians had quitted, thus, no doubt, threatening their rear, but, threatening it with a force which did not impede their operations, which would not even be troublesome so soon as the Vistula was between them, and which they knew well their approach to the capital would immediately recal for its defence. Warsaw itself, had prepared for a siege. On the first of July the government called out the levy *en masse*; the populace were employed night and day in forming entrenchments and strong fortifications on the side from which the city was now threatened. But as the crisis approached, want of confidence and harmony began to be manifested. Adverse fortune, as commonly happens, was ascribed, in the popular mind, to dishonest



or unskilful conduct. The failure of all attempts to raise insurrection in the neighbouring provinces—the defeats in Volhynia—the annihilation of all their hopes in Lithuania—so many battles fought and successes gained, and yet cooped up at last, apparently helpless, within the walls of Warsaw—occasioned doubt and discontent. Even conspiracies were said to have been discovered among some of their generals, and the Russian prisoners of war, to seize the city, and deliver it to the enemy. The popularity of Skrzynecki gave way; for he had been unable to render talent superior to equal talent and overwhelming numbers. Like a skilful soldier, he would not promulgate his plans to the members of the government, and the populace of the city. The government appointed a council of war, to receive from him an account of his intended military operations, and to report whether they seemed fitting to be adopted. This was done by the same people, who, a few months before, had appointed a dictator, with unlimited and irresponsible power, when no enemy was near, and the crisis of their fate was not even expected.

While these doubts and dissensions reigned in Warsaw, the Russian army, amounting, it was stated, to 60,000 men, had established itself on the left bank of the Vistula, and commenced its advance against the city. The corps of Rudiger, at the same time, being left at liberty by the Polish forces, who had watched him in Volhynia, being called in for the defence of the capital, crossed the Vistula above Warsaw, and moved round, to the southward of it, to join the main army. The Polish army had taken up a

position, a few leagues to the westward of the capital, between Kolo and Lowicz. They were attacked and driven from it, without much serious fighting, and took up a new position behind the Rawka and Bzura, still nearer to Warsaw. The Russians continued to spread themselves on all sides, their commander apparently being unwilling to make the last assault, till he should be joined by the corps which he was daily expecting from the south. It appeared, likewise, that the heads of the government at Warsaw, now convinced that further resistance was hopeless, had been attempting negotiation, but this only led to revolution and confusion, while the enemy was at the gates. A patriotic club, joined by some unprincipled officers, excited the populace to throw off all restraint. General Skrzynecki, finding himself an object of odium, resigned the command, on the 13th of August, and was succeeded by Dembienski, whose retreat from Lithuania, after the discomfiture of Gielgud and Chlapowski, was still in the freshness of its popularity. This, was not enough; the populace, headed by members of the club, proceeded to the palace of the government, and demanded that the general should be brought to trial. The government, in the foolish hope of soothing them, had the weakness to promise it. With success, their numbers and violence increased. They proceeded to the royal prison, where a guard of 200 men made no resistance; the gates were forced open; the prisoners, some of them Poles suspected of political offences, and some of them Russians, were dragged into the streets and murdered in cold blood. Among them were generals



Jankowsky and Bukowsky, who had commanded the unsuccessful operations against Rudiger in Volhynia: they had been accused of treason to gratify the populace and the clubs; they had been tried and acquitted; they were now assassinated. The prisons contained some ladies, whom political jealousy had confined on suspicion of Russianism: they shared the same fate, and their mutilated bodies were thrown out to outrage in the public streets. The same treatment was extended to the inmates of other prisons. Upwards of sixty persons were stated to have perished by the hands of the populace. The governor of the city, left without regular troops, was unable to check these atrocities, which were continued during the 16th, even some of the Russian prisoners of war being put to death. At length several regiments were sent into the city from the army, and some degree of order was restored—the Polish troops being thus required against their fellow citizens, when they ought to have been facing the Russians. The government, feeling its weakness, resigned its powers into the hands of the diet, and the diet immediately invested general Krukowiecki with almost dictatorial authority.

Amid this change of commanders, want of plan, and confusion of all government, Paskewitsch advanced, on the 16th and 17th, against the Polish position behind the Bzura. The Poles immediately retreated, and retired at length within the entrenchments immediately before Warsaw, where the last stake was to be played for. On the 18th of August, the head quarters of the Russian commander were within three miles of War-

saw, and by the position of his army, the capital and the troops now collected under its walls, were surrounded on almost every side, and deprived of all resources from the country. Several days, however, still passed in inaction, Paskewitsch waiting the junction of the corps which had been clearing and securing the country to the south, and employing himself in the meantime in making the necessary preparations for storming the lines which were the last defence of Warsaw. Probably, too, he might expect, that the gradual approach of famine, when he should have cut off all supplies, might subdue the obstinacy of the garrison or of the inhabitants. These hopes having failed, and the terms of surrender which he offered having been rejected, he attacked the Polish lines on the morning of the 6th of September. They were furiously assaulted, and as furiously defended; but, by the close of the day, the Russians had made themselves masters of the first line of entrenchments. The earlier part of the 7th having been spent in new and unavailing attempts to arrange the terms of a surrender, the second line of entrenchments was attacked. The combat was now even more murderous than on the preceding day. Fresh bodies of Poles, taking the place of those who were swept away by the Russian artillery, contested every inch of ground, fighting to the very edges of the ditches, and for a moment, seemed about to regain the advantage. But the Russians rallied, pressed on with irresistible fury, carrying every thing before them at the point of the bayonet, and before evening they had carried all the entrenchments, and Warsaw lay at their mercy. Had they



been compelled to enter it amid continued resistance, or even been admitted as conquerors, when scarcely cooled from the attack, the consequences would probably have been frightful; but, the city having capitulated on the evening of the 7th, Paskewitsch agreed not to enter it till next day, the remainder of the Polish army being allowed, in the mean time, to retire to Plozk. The Russian army, accordingly, accompanied by the emperor's brother, the grand duke Michael, entered Warsaw on the morning of the 8th of September, and persons and property were saved from outrage. Of the loss of the Poles during these two days' fighting among entrenchments, no account was given, except that the Russians claimed 3,000 prisoners, including 60 staff and superior officers. Their own loss they stated at 3,000 killed, including 63 officers, and 7,500 wounded, among whom were 445 officers.

The Russian commander maintained that, when he consented that the Polish army, on the evening before he entered Warsaw, should retire to Plozk, he considered them to have submitted, and that they were there to await the pleasure of the emperor. The Poles, however, who were now commanded by general Rybinski, stopped short at the fortress of Modlin, and began to make preparations for military movements. The enterprise was desperate. Paskewitsch at length directed his troops against them. Finding themselves hemmed in on every side, rather than submit to the Russians, they crossed the frontier into Prussia, laid down their arms, and sought refuge in exile. In the south, too, some detached corps of what had been the Polish army,

endeavoured to maintain an unavailing resistance, but were compelled, one after another, either to capitulate, or to pass into Austria and the territory of Cracow, to lay down their arms. In the course of a month from the surrender of Warsaw, the whole of Poland was again reduced under unconditional subjection to its former master, and an insurrection was extinguished which, though originating from no previous concert, had assumed at once an attitude of defiance, trusting, from the condition of European politics, to foreign aid that was never granted—which had astonished Europe by the boldness and unexpected, though temporary, success of its resistance to the colossal power of Russia—which had exhibited, during its progress, much heroism, and much devoted willingness to expend life, and liberty, and fortune, for the independence of the country, but had closed in discontent, distrust, and confusion.

The evils of war in this part of eastern Europe, were accompanied by, and assisted in propagating, a much more mortal and extensive calamity, which had gradually been moving westward from the interior of the Russian empire. A pestilential disease, denominated cholera morbus, of which the symptoms have been described and the history traced in a former part of this volume,\* had appeared at Moscow towards the close of the preceding year, and, outliving the winter, again manifested itself in spring, and spread, not only to the capital, but into Poland, Moldavia, Galicia, and Hungary. In all of these countries, where the lower orders of the people live on

---

\* See page [298].



scanty food, and amid uncleanly habits, the mortality was great. In Moscow, out of nearly 7,000 persons who were attacked, about 4,000 died. In the beginning of March it showed itself in the government of Minsk, and cut off, by the 1st of June, 1,246 out of 2,268 persons who had been attacked. It came in contact with the armies of Russia and Poland, thinned their numbers, and drawing food from the misery which attended their movements, advanced, on the one side to Warsaw and Cracow, then spreading itself into Galicia, and, on the other, descended the Dwina to Riga and its neighbourhood. It raged in the latter place, from the month of May to the end of July, during which period, out of about 5,000 cases of disease, more than 2,000 terminated in death. Revel, and various other places between Riga and St. Petersburg, were likewise attacked, till, towards the end of June, the pestilence entered the capital itself. During the first four or five days, it did not occasion much alarm; but at the commencement of July, it increased with such frightful vigour, that the numbers seized exceeded, for some time, 500 persons a-day, more than one-half of whom died. From the middle of July its violence diminished; and by the end of October, it had almost entirely disappeared, having occasioned, up to that date, more than 4,000 deaths out of within very nearly 10,000 cases, exclusive of its ravages in Cronstadt and other places in the neighbourhood. In the mean time, it had entered Prussia, both by Koenigsberg and Dantzic, and by Pozen, which it seemed to have reached from Poland by the Warta. In Konigs-

berg it had carried off, by the 31st of August, 705 out of 1,215 persons attacked, and in Dantzic, by the 11th of September, 1,028 out of 1,411. In Pozen, the number attacked amounted, on the 2nd of September, to 749, out of whom 453 had died. The Prussian capital had been preparing itself for the approach of this formidable invader, whose most powerful allies seemed to be want of food and of cleanliness. It appeared within the walls of Berlin in the first days of September, but the numbers who were attacked by it were much smaller, as compared with the population, than in the large towns of Russia and Poland, or even of the Prussian provinces. By the end of October, when its power was expiring, 1,274 cases had terminated fatally out of 2,005. At Hamburg, where it next appeared, on the 8th of October, it was still more lenient. In the course of six weeks, within which the violence of the disease seemed generally to exhaust itself, only about 300 individuals had been attacked; nearly two-thirds of them died. It then crossed the sea to England.

While taking this north-westerly course, the pestilence had moved still more rapidly in another direction into Moldavia, from which it penetrated into Hungary, and ascended the Danube. In this direction it was still more destructive than in the north. In the end of June and beginning of July, the deaths at Jassy were, for some time, at the rate of 300 a-day, and, by the beginning of August, it had swept away 7,000 inhabitants. At Limberg, in the course of May and June, more than 3,000 persons had been attacked, of whom one-half perished.



But even this was trifling compared with the mortality in Hungary. The disease appeared in that kingdom in the month of June, manifesting itself in the north, and spreading rapidly, partly to the south, but much more decidedly to the west. It raged till the end of September, by which time 256,000 individuals had been attacked, of whom 102,657 had died. It followed the course of the Danube upwards, and broke out in Vienna on the 13th of September, in defiance of all the military and police regulations which had been adopted to cut off all communication between Hungary and the capital. Here, too, however, it was less destructive than the fears of the gay and voluptuous Viennese had led them to apprehend. During two months which elapsed before the pestilence took its leave, about 3,500 individuals were attacked, and the deaths were less than one-half. Vienna seemed to be the limit of its march in this direction. The other provinces of the empire, and all to the westward and south of them, escaped the destroyer. The disease, while raging in Europe, was equally destructive in Egypt, where it was said to have swept off four per cent of the population. In the month of May it carried off 5,500 persons from among the pilgrims of Mecca alone, in little more than three weeks.

In some of the infected countries, the physical malady was attended by a moral pestilence still more deplorable. The disease uniformly sought its victims principally among the lower classes of the people. Medical skill seemed equally unavailing to detect its nature, or to repel its attacks.

Whether it was contagious, communicated by an infected person and by infected goods, or whether it was epidemic, professional men were unable to decide. Without waiting the determination of such questions, the public authorities of the countries which it threatened to approach, or had already entered, provided hospitals into which the sick were immediately removed. The populace, finding themselves thus exposed to an enemy who made what appeared to them so invidious a distinction between the rich and the poor, and falling beneath the attacks of a disease unlike, in the revolting nature of its symptoms and the frightful rapidity with which it produced death, to any ailment known among them, took up the idea, that the pretended disease was the result of a conspiracy of the upper classes to sweep away by poison their miserable inferiors. In Hungary, where the disease was most violent, and the ignorance of the people profound, the peasantry, under the influence of this extravagant notion, rose in open insurrection, sacked the castles of the nobility, imprisoned and outraged their persons, and perpetrated the most brutal excesses and atrocious murders. Their vengeance extended to the officers employed in enforcing the quarantine regulations, and to all medical men, who were believed to be the prime instruments of the conspiracy. Chlorate of lime having been brought into general use as a preventive against infection, the peasantry, finding quantities of this preparation in many of the houses which they plundered, felt all their convictions strengthened by thus detecting, as they imagined, the very material with which the waters were



poisoned to insure their destruction. It was only by placing considerable bodies of military in the disturbed districts that peace was restored. St. Petersburg was, for several days, the scene of riots proceeding from similar causes. The populace believed that the sick were carried off to the hos-

pitals, only that they might be the more conveniently dispatched by the medical attendants; and a prudential regulation, that dead bodies should be immediately interred, produced, in the minds of the vulgar, a firm belief, that their unfortunate mates were buried alive.



## CHAP. XIV. •

**SPAIN.**—*Insurrection at Cadiz—Defeat of the rebels—Arrests and executions at Madrid—Unsuccessful attempt of General Torrijos.*  
**PORTUGAL.**—*Complaints of the British Government, and demands for satisfaction—A fleet is sent to the Tagus, and satisfaction obtained—Complaints of the French government—Satisfaction is refused—France makes reprisals on the Portuguese flag—Britain refuses the application of Portugal to interfere—A French fleet dispatched to Lisbon—The demands of the French admiral refused, till he forces the Tagus—The French carry off the Portuguese fleet—State of Lisbon—Return of Don Pedro from Brazil to Europe—He makes preparations for a descent on Portugal—Unsuccessful insurrection by part of the garrison of Lisbon—British men of war sent to Lisbon and Oporto—The forces of the Regency of Terceira capture the island of St. George, and the island of St. Michael—Defensive preparations of Don Miguel.*  
**ITALY.**—*Election of a Pope—Plan of general Insurrection—Insurrection at Modena—The Duke leaves it and a provisional government is established—Insurrection and establishment of a provisional government at Bologna—It becomes general in the Legations—Insurrection at Parma—Proclamations of the insurgents to the inhabitants of Austrian Lombardy and of Naples—Differences between France and Austria—The Austrian troops cross the Po against the insurgents, who immediately disperse—The insurrection put down, and the former government restored in Modena, in Parma, and in the Papal States—New troubles in the Papal Legations—Death of the King of Sardinia.*  
**GREECE.**—*Unpopularity of the President—Maina and Hydra revolt—The Hydriots take possession of the Greek fleet at Poros—The Russian fleet blockades them, and demands the surrender of the ships—The President attacks Poros by land, and is repulsed—Its inhabitants are removed to Hydra—The Russian admiral prepares to attack the Greek fleet—Its commander Miaulis blows it up—Proceedings of the Mainotes—Assassination of the President.*

**T**HE fate of the insufficient and ill-concerted attempt of Mina and Valdez to revolutionize Spain in 1830, did not prevent the kingdom from being the scene, during the present year of two similar attempts, still more hasty and foolish. The first was prepared by a band of the refugees at Gibraltar, at whose head was a general Torrijos, who had succeeded in corrupting the garrison of the Isle de Leon

at Cadiz. Their first exploit was the assassination, on the 3rd of March, of the Governor of Cadiz: five or six of the patriots lay in wait for him in one of the streets of the city and stabbed him in the back. On this, as a signal, the military and marines in the Isle de Leon, rose in mutiny, arrested the constituted authorities, and proclaimed the constitution. But they were disappointed in the ex-



pectation, if they ever entertained it, of being joined by the populace and garrison of Cadiz. On the contrary, general Quesada, the governor of Andalusia, having hastened thither on the same day from Xeres, put it in a state of defence against any possible attack. The rebels, to save themselves from being immured in the Isle, were thus compelled to leave it. They quitted it on the 4th, and landing on the opposite coast, marched in the direction of Tarifa, with the intention of seizing that place, and effecting a junction with a band of their confederates who were marching through the mountains from Gibraltar, under the command of one Manzanares, to join them. But the royal troops were already in pursuit of them from all quarters. They were overtaken at Bejer; they scarcely attempted to fight; 400 of them surrendered; the others dispersed themselves in the mountain. Of those who were made prisoners, the more distinguished personages were immediately shot. The corps of Manzanares, on learning the failure of the enterprise, likewise dissolved, having lost its leader in a scuffle with some peasantry in the mountains.

This insurrection was, or was represented by the government to be, only one branch of a widely extended conspiracy the secret instigators of which were in the capital. Numbers of seditious placards were found every morning scattered in the streets; it was said that the police, in domiciliary visits to the houses of suspected persons, had discovered large collections of tri-coloured cockades, inscribed with legends in honour of France, liberty, and the constitution; that money, brought from

beyond the Pyrennees, had been distributed among the troops; and that everything had been prepared for an insurrection for which the explosion in the Isle of Leon and at Cadiz was to be the signal. To eradicate the conspiracy, a permanent military commission was established at Madrid, and power was given to the captains general to establish similar courts in the provinces, where they should think it useful. The jurisdiction of the commission extended to every possible shade of political offence, including even the writing of pasquinades, and the circulating of alarming intelligence regarding the strength of real or imagined rebels; and all persons were subjected to it, of whatever rank, state, or condition. By a subsequent decree, robbery was likewise placed under the cognizance of the commission. The erection of this tribunal, and the activity of the police, spread terror among all in Madrid, who were liberally inclined; for suspicion exposed its object to evils only short of the death which would have followed certain guilt; though executions were few, there was no deficiency of arbitrary imprisonments. One man was hanged for having uttered some obnoxious expressions when drunk. One of his judges, having refused to sign the sentence, as being inhumanly severe, was dismissed for his recusancy. A bookseller exposed himself to suspicion, by visiting the wife of a very obnoxious liberal, who had escaped. On his house being searched, a tri-coloured flag and a private printing press were found in his cellars. He was forthwith hanged. After the execution, a priest mounted the steps of the ladder, and delivered to the ad-



ming multitude a discourse on the peculiar care which heaven bestowed on discovering and punishing the enemies of the church and of his most faithful majesty. The military commissions, however, employed themselves more actively, and far more usefully, with robbers and assassins, who were rendering the streets of Madrid unsafe, than with political offenders. The latter were allowed to linger in their dungeons, probably because they had been consigned to them for no better reason than the apprehensions of the government.

But neither the blood shed in actual conflict, nor the executions and imprisonments which were sure to follow its unsuccessful termination, could deter hot-headed men from renewing these hopeless insurrections, which seemed to be perpetrated with a wilful want of all concert and preparation, and a wilful blindness to the power against which those engaged in them deliberately dashed themselves. After the failure of the attempt at Cadiz in March, Torrijos, its prime instigator, had employed himself in framing the plan of a new invasion. This could not be permitted on the territory of a friendly power. Obligated to leave Gibraltar, he sailed on the 28th of November for Malaga, along with his companions, among whom was an Irish gentleman, in all fifty-three in number. It was alleged that he was induced by the promise of the governor of Malaga, to join him—which, even if true would have little palliated the rashness of the attempt, after what had happened not many months before. The Spanish authorities, however, seemed to have been informed of their motions. Pursued

by a number of Guarda-costas, they were compelled to run their small vessels on shore not far from Malaga, on the 2nd December. The party, on their landing, were followed, and surrounded in a farm house, by a considerable body of troops, against whom resistance was hopeless. They surrendered; on the 5th they were marched into Malaga, where, so soon as orders could be received from Madrid, every one of them was shot, under the authority of the proclamation which had been issued by Ferdinand in October of the preceding year to meet the threatened invasion of Mina.

PORTUGAL, whilst Spain was exposed to these disturbances from within, encountered more serious dangers and disgraces from without. From the moment of the suppression of the unfortunate Oporto expedition in 1828, the government of Don Miguel had given just cause of offence to the British ministry by its lawless proceedings towards various British subjects, and against British property. The privileges of the judge conservator, under whose protection British subjects were placed by treaty, had been violated, to expose them to the insults and oppressions of Don Miguel's police. When accused of offences which entitled the Portuguese government to interfere—and these alleged offences were always connected with supposed political trespasses—they were not brought to any fair trial, even according to the laws of Portugal, but detained in loathsome and unhealthy dungeons, where they were compelled to submit to every indignity which the subordinate agents of a brutal government chose to inflict. In



the Autumn of 1830 was added to these offences the illegal seizure of British vessels by the Portuguese squadron cruising off Terceira. One of their frigates boarded the *St. Helena* packet, subjected its crew and passengers to the most cruel and unmanly treatment, although among them were officers and invalided seamen in the British service. For all these outrages and offences, reparation had been incessantly and indignantly demanded, but in vain. The Portuguese minister expressed his sorrow at their occurrence, and disclaimed any share in them on the part of the government; but no mark of disapprobation was set on the perpetrators, and no means adopted to prevent their repetition. In the beginning of the present year, the outrages offered to British residents became even more alarming than before. A Mr. O'Neile, a British merchant, was thrown into prison without any cause being assigned. The house of a Mr. Roberts, another merchant, was forcibly entered during the night by a civil and military force. The manufactory of a third, a Mr. Caffary, was entered in the same manner, and his foreman carried to prison ostensibly by the express order of Don Miguel himself. These were accompanied and followed by other excesses, which threw the British residents into the greatest alarm for their persons and property. The consul-general at length assured the government at home, that, "so long as the authorities of this country are permitted to entertain the conviction that his Majesty's government will be appeased by the mere protestations of their regret for acts which are unparalleled among any other people pretending to

civilization, neither the persons nor the property of British subjects can be considered as secure in this country, nor must we be surprised if not a week passes without a repetition of similar insults." In consequence of this communication, the consul-general was instructed to demand, within ten days, satisfaction for certain specified grievances, and the particular satisfaction itself was set down. It was demanded, 1, that the commander of the Portuguese frigate who captured the *St. Helena* packet, and maltreated her crew and passengers, should be dismissed from the service; 2, payment, within a month, of compensation to the owners of vessels which had been captured or boarded and injured by the Portuguese squadron off Terceira: 3, the dismissal of the magistrates who had entered Mr. O'Neile's house, and particularly of a noted agent of police, named Verissimo, by whose orders that gentleman had been treated like a criminal, in violation of his privileges as a British subject: 4, the public disavowal and dismissal of the officer who had entered the premises of Mr. Caffary, and imprisoned his foreman, with a specified sum as compensation to the latter for his illegal confinement; 5, a similar disavowal and dismissal of the magistrate who had forcibly entered the house of Mr. Roberts. In all these instances, the dismissal of the individuals was to be forthwith notified in the *Lisbon Gazette*, with a statement of the causes which occasioned it, and an assurance that they should not again be employed in any way, or under any pretence. It was further demanded, 6, that the illegal exaction of excessive duties on the im-



portation of articles of British manufacture, should immediately cease : 7, that compensation should be made to a British gentleman who had been unwarrantably conveyed across the frontier at Elvas, and compelled to travel to Seville to procure a Portuguese signature to his passport, and that sure means should be taken to prevent the recurrence of any similar treatment of a British subject : 8, a severe and public reprimand of an officer who had attempted to levy on British subjects certain dues from which that character exempted them ; 9, the immediate dismissal of the person whom the government had appointed to the office of judge conservator of the British privileges, and the recognition of the gentleman who had been duly chosen by the British merchants at Oporto ; and 10, a positive engagement that the rights of British subjects would henceforth be duly and strictly observed. It was added that none of these demands admitted of the slightest negotiation or modification. The government of Don Miguel, however, would probably have treated them with the same contempt which it had bestowed on previous remonstrances, had they not been supported by force. They were carried out by a squadron of six ships of war, which cruised off the mouth of the Tagus, while the Portuguese minister was deliberating on his reply. The nature of that reply was determined by the notice with which the consul concluded his demands, that, in the event of their being refused, he had instructions to quit Lisbon, and the squadron would forthwith execute reprisals by detaining and sending to England all vessels bearing the Portuguese

flag. Before the limited time elapsed, every demand was complied with, and the *Lisbon Gazette* announced, on the 2nd of May, the dismissal of all the obnoxious magistrates and officers for having been guilty of oppressive conduct towards British subjects.

This example was not lost upon France, who had causes of complaint somewhat similar, although her subjects did not enjoy in Portugal the same peculiar privileges which belong to British residents. M. Bonhomme, a French student at Coimbra, was condemned to be publicly whipped through the streets of the capital, and then transported to Africa, for committing a breach of public decency in the cathedral during passion week. M. Sauvinet, a French merchant in Lisbon, was accused of having been engaged in a conspiracy which was to have exploded in the month of February. The signal of rebellion was to be the discharge of sky-rockets, and on the testimony of a sergeant that a rocket was seen to ascend from Mr. Sauvinet's garden, this gentleman was sent to a horrible dungeon, kept in secret confinement for weeks, and afterwards banished for life to the burning coast of Africa. No farther evidence connected M. Sauvinet with the rocket conspiracy, or justified the terrible sentence pronounced against him. Other subjects of France had been arbitrarily arrested at Oporto and Lisbon, but had suffered no other indignity than their confinement. The French government, after repeated remonstrances had failed, sent a small squadron to Lisbon to support their consul in demanding redress. The Portuguese government, on the other hand, actually hastened M. Bonhomme's punish-



ment on learning that a French brig of war, having despatches on board for the consul, had been off the mouth of the river, and was driven to sea again by contrary winds; and it was said that Don Miguel, upon being told that her object was to claim the immediate liberation of this individual, replied, 'that they should have him, but with his back well flayed.' The demands of the consul, who claimed the liberation of Messieurs Bonhomme and Sauvinet, as well as of the other imprisoned Frenchmen, with large pecuniary indemnities to each of them, were evaded, on the pretext that a consul was not an agent with whom negotiations could be carried on, and it was the fault of France that there was no Portuguese minister at Paris. The consul quitted Lisbon. The French squadron, consisting of two frigates, and some smaller craft soon afterwards appeared, and its commander repeated the demands, forty-eight hours being allowed for a categorical answer, at the end of which time, if the conditions offered were not agreed to, he would leave the Tagus with the French subjects at Lisbon on board. The expected concession did not arrive; the squadron finally sailed without it, and immediately began reprisals on the Portuguese flag. Don Miguel then claimed the aid of the British government, apparently in the idea that, as he was not at war with Britain, the latter was bound by treaty to defend him against all aggressors. The application, of course, was unavailing. Lord Palmerston's answer was, that his Britannic Majesty was perfectly aware of all the obligations towards Portugal imposed "by the treaties which subsist between

the two countries, treaties which are not abrogated or suspended by the present discontinuance of diplomatic relation between the two governments, or by the circumstance that the person in whose name the government of Portugal is now administered, is not recognized by the king of Portugal. But his majesty's government do not admit, that the true meaning of those treaties can compel them blindly to take up any quarrel into which a Portuguese administration may in its infatuation plunge its country, or to defend that administration, right or wrong, against all whom it may choose to injure or affront. His Majesty's government take a deep interest in the welfare of Portugal, and would sincerely lament any misfortune which might befall that country. But if those who now govern Portugal, despising all considerations of ordinary prudence, and neglecting and rejecting the counsels which may be given them, rush without just grounds into a contest with a Power with which they are utterly unable to cope, upon those persons must lie the heavy responsibility of all the calamities which may ensue."

As the capture of Portuguese merchantmen produced no redress, France resolved on more energetic operations. A squadron consisting of three sail of the line, two frigates, a corvette, and three brigs, under the command of admiral Roussin, accompanied by transports and steam vessels carrying a considerable body of troops, arrived off the mouth of the Tagus on the 8th of July. A flag of truce was sent in, demanding the immediate concession of all the conditions which had previously been insisted on by the French government, with an addi-



tional demand of a pecuniary indemnity to France to cover the expenses of the expedition. The Portuguese government, either relying on the prudent fears of the French squadron, or the unascertained strength of its own defences, evaded the demand, and proposed to treat for satisfaction under the mediation of England. On receiving an answer to that effect, the French admiral forced, on the 11th of July, the entrance of the Tagus, and passing through the fire of the fortresses which line its banks, anchored his squadron within gunshot of the Royal Palace, on the heights below Lisbon. From this station he wrote to the government, "Here I am before Lisbon; but France, ever generous, will treat on the same conditions as before the victory. In gathering its fruits, however, I reserve to myself the right of adding thereto indemnities for the victims of the war." This letter was written on the 11th, when the war—if a war existed—had ceased, and the admiral declared in the plainest terms, that he will "treat on the same conditions as before the victory." These conditions had all been set forth in the *ultimatum* of the 8th, three days before the hostile visit.

Two hours more were allowed to Don Miguel to accede to the propositions which had been made before the fleet entered the Tagus; and before they elapsed, arrived the answer of the Portuguese government, announcing its consent to every thing that had been demanded. No sooner, however, had these terms been agreed to, than the French admiral seemed to think that he had gained an excellent opportunity of making a show of a naval victory cheaply purchased. On the following day, he claimed

the whole Portuguese fleet, lying in the Tagus, as prizes of war. "As the late event has given to France those rights which military success confers among all nations, it is my duty to exercise them. I have therefore the honour to declare to your excellency, that I consider as French property the Portuguese men of war which lowered their flag under the fire of my squadron." The "late event" was the forcing the entrance of the Tagus, and coming up to Lisbon in defiance of the forts. All this had happened before he made his demands on the Portuguese government on the 11th, and, in that communication, he had even boasted of the generosity of France in tendering the same terms after victory which she had offered before the conflict. To seize the fleet, therefore, was an after thought, in violation of the terms which the one party had proposed, and the other had accepted, as the final termination of the dispute. Admiral Roussin, in fact, immediately brought forth an entirely new series of negotiation. He proposed that as the commerce of Britain enjoyed particular advantages in Portugal, the Portuguese government should agree, that, in the event of any renewal of the treaties with foreign powers, France should be placed on the same footing with the most favoured nation. The Portuguese government refused this article, and merely agreed that, in the event of future commercial arrangements, it would be disposed to treat in a manner reciprocally advantageous to both countries. It was likewise stipulated and acceded that there should be established at Lisbon a judge conservator, who should be an agent of the French government, to watch over the liberty



and safety of French subjects. The admiral even offered to restore the fleet, if the Portuguese government would set at liberty 400 prisoners to be named by him, and who should engage, on their parole, not to take part in any hostile expedition which might be directed against the existing government of Portugal. To this they would not accede, and the ships of war were conveyed to Brest, to flatter the vanity and swell the pride of the people of France, to whose liberal politicians some substitute was due for a gratification which they had expected, but had not received, from this expedition—that of seeing the French fleet employed in stirring up and assisting a revolution in Portugal.

Nor did Don Miguel, while thus receiving chastisement from foreigners, remain undisturbed by internal conspiracies among the people whom he ruled with a rod of iron. The plot, for a supposed connection with which the Frenchman, Sauvinet, had been condemned, had been discovered, and counteracted before it broke out. Its discovery was followed by the institution of a special commission at Lisbon, consisting of four judges, and three superior military officers, to try all persons accused of exciting to revolt, sedition, or tumultuous assemblages, in Lisbon or Oporto. The proceedings were to be “summary and merely verbal, without the legal formalities of which persons guilty of such execrable acts are unworthy,” and the sentences were to be executed in four and twenty hours after being passed. This tribunal was declared to have been rendered necessary by attempts which had been made to corrupt the fidelity of the garrison of Lisbon, and seven persons were

speedily executed for having been concerned, as was pretended, in these seditious designs. The prisoners were first strangled, then beheaded, and then the head and the trunk were publicly burnt, and their ashes thrown into the Tagus. The visits of the English and French squadrons, but particularly the capture of the fleet by the latter, exposed the suspected natives to still more indiscriminating oppression. Miguel and his party, humbled in the dust before the strong, took vengeance on the weak who were within their power. They had dreaded that the French expedition was in league with concealed conspirators in Lisbon, and that it had entered the Tagus, in the expectation that a rising would take place. Their measures of precaution consisted in letting loose the fury of their brutal adherents, under the protection of cannon placed in the principal streets, and double guards at all important points, and strong detachments of troops parading the city. Persons suspected of being averse to the existing order of things were attacked and beaten by bands of ruffians, who strolled about with bludgeons in open day, winked at by the police, if not actually in its employment. The police itself followed its usual course in filling the dungeons with crowds of prisoners.

But a more formidable opponent, and a more serious danger were now approaching. In the early part of the year, in consequence of a revolution in Brazil, Don Pedro had resigned his South American crown in favour of his son, and had returned to Europe, in the end of May, bringing along with him his daughter Donna Maria, in the character of whose regent as queen



of Portugal, Miguel had first obtained the power which he had immediately transferred to his own person, and had ever since been abusing. Don Pedro expressed no intention of re-claiming the crown for himself; but declared his resolution, as guardian of his daughter, to make every effort for the restoration of her rights, and the re-establishment of the constitution which had been his parting gift to Portugal. He and his daughter proceeded to France, where they were amicably received by the government: and he began to collect, in that country and in England, such an armament in ships and men as would enable him, when joined to the force already at the command of the regency and at Terceira, to make a descent on Lisbon or Oporto. Neither the government of Britain nor that of France gave him open assistance; they professed to maintain a strict neutrality; but neither of them opposed any obstacle to his measures of recruiting. In the ranks of those whom he had collected were to be found officers of both nations, and many British seamen. In the end of December 300 half-pay officers and volunteers sailed from Liverpool for Belleisle, on the coast of France which had been appointed the place of rendezvous.

The effect which the re-appearance of Don Pedro might have on the Portuguese was to Don Miguel a source of greater uneasiness than the force which he might bring to support an invasion, and the breaking out of the most alarming insurrection to which he had yet been exposed, convinced him that there were even masses of his military in whom he could not trust. On the night of the 21st of August

about 800 men of one of the regiments in garrison at Lisbon turned out in mutiny, and divided themselves into three columns, the first marching towards Val de Pereiro, to the quarters of the 16th regiment; the second, to Alcantara, those of the first cavalry; and the last, to the Rochio. Their bands played the constitutional hymn, and they shouted 'Vivas' for Don Pedro and Donna Maria II, and 'Death to the Tyrant.' Nearly the whole of the guards whom they passed, and who did not declare in their favour, were shot; but the first column, instead of meeting with allies in the 16th regiment, as they had expected, were received with a destructive volley of musketry. It was returned, and after a good deal of fighting, they proceeded to the Rochio, where they joined their comrades who had succeeded in reaching it. The party despatched for Alcantara was met by royalists and police forces, and overwhelmed by numbers, not however without a severe struggle and killing many of their opponents. At the Rochio, the mutineers had to encounter the whole of the 16th, and heavy bodies of royalists and police. A brisk fire was kept up for about two hours; but the insurgents were compelled to give way mainly in consequence of a want of ammunition. A major of police was killed; and it was stated that the lives of upwards of 300 individuals had been lost in the affair. The officers of the insurgents refused to accompany their men, and a captain, who called to arms when the place which contained the colours of the regiment was broken open, was instantly shot dead. The surviving soldiers were nearly all taken. A court martial was immediately



convoked for the trial of the offenders, forty of whom were soon afterwards shot. The suppressed insurrection only increased the fears of the government, and the brutality of its partizans. All, who, it might be supposed, would lean to the cause of Don Pedro and his daughter, were openly maltreated, or secretly imprisoned. Every fortress, and the prisons in every town, were said to be filled with alleged state criminals. At Lisbon alone, the dungeons and prison ships were represented to contain, by the middle of September, no fewer than 3,000 persons, confined on account of their supposed opinions.

Amid the lawless violence which reigned in the capital, the fears of the foreign residents were again excited. On the 25th of August, the British merchants addressed a representation to their Consul-general, in which they complained, not of personal injuries, but of injuries inflicted on Portuguese subjects who were their customers, and of which they said that, though not amounting to a direct attack on their property, they were equally ruinous in their consequences. "Several native merchants and shopkeepers," they said, "indebted to us to a considerable amount, have of late been arrested, not in the regular course of justice, nor even for crimes alleged—far less proved—against them, but apparently at the caprice of a set of ruffians of the lowest description, supported by the police. There is every likelihood of this system being carried to still greater lengths, and we have therefore the strongest reason to fear that the majority of our debtors will be ruined; and as it is well known

VOL. LXXIII.

that they trade principally on our capital, it is evident that we shall eventually be the real sufferers by the excesses we complain of, and from which the laws of every country are bound to protect those who live under their jurisdiction. Within the last few days these outrages have been carried to a pitch hardly ever equalled in a civilized country, armed men having entered the shops of our customers, assaulting and wounding the owners, and destroying their property—injuries undoubtedly brought upon them in a great measure by their known friendship to the English." On this representation being transmitted to the government at home, a couple of men of war were despatched immediately to Oporto, and two others to Lisbon, to protect the persons and property of British subjects from actual violence. The injury, which their mercantile interests might suffer from Miguel's tyrannical treatment of his own subjects, was too indirect to justify new demands or actual intervention.

While Don Pedro was collecting means for the re-establishment of his daughter's rights, the regency, which governed in her name at Terceira, and the Azores, was not inactive. On the 9th of May, an expedition from Angra, commanded by Villa Flor, succeeded in capturing another of the islands, St. George. This was followed by an expedition against St. Michael's, which was garrisoned by 3000 men, and was expected to present a more vigorous resistance. Villa Flor again took the command himself. He sailed from Angra on the 30th of July with 1500 men, on board of nineteen vessels of small size, with a number of still

[2 G]



lighter craft for the purpose of disembarking; and three gun boats. On the following day they came in sight of St. Michael's and landed on the morning of the 1st of August, at a point on the northern coast of the island, where there were no troops. They proceeded towards the interior, and in the course of the same day met the advanced guard of the Miguelite army, composed of 200 Caçadores and infantry, some militia, and a piece of artillery. It was immediately attacked by two companies of Caçadores, and routed, leaving the piece of artillery and two captains, and eight soldiers dead, and 20 men prisoners, with all the powder in reserve. On the 2nd, at day-break, the invaders began their march to Ribeira Grande, where the enemy was awaiting them with his whole united force, in a chosen position. They had in the field 2,600 men, eight pieces of artillery, and two howitzers, the whole commanded by a lieutenant-colonel of artillery, named Silva Reis. Villa Flor had only 1,500 men, and the single gun, captured the preceding day, as his own could not be landed. He divided his forces into two columns, one to attack the road which was defended with four pieces, and a strong intrenchment; the other, composed of the battalion of the 5th Caçadores, was to attack the right flank of the enemy. The Caçadores began the attack, and the action continued till 2 o'clock, without their being able to force the road. At 2 however, they made a general attack with such vigour that the Miguelites could no longer keep the field, and began their flight, leaving a great number of dead and wounded, four field pieces, and upwards of

sixty barrels of gunpowder. The victors entered Ribeira Grande at 6 in the evening, nearly at the same time with the enemy, of whom a great number were made prisoners. Before night news arrived that the town of Ponte d' Elgado had the same day proclaimed Donna Maria II; that the governor Prego had fled on board an English ship; and that many soldiers were entering the city, and had given up their arms. In the course of another day, the whole island was in possession of the regency.

Alarmed at these successes, obtained with such small means, the government of Don Miguel became apprehensive that Madeira itself would be the next object of attack, and two frigates and a corvette, with three hundred troops on board were dispatched from the Tagus, in the end of September, to reinforce its garrison. The apprehended invasion by Don Pedro, as well as the late exhibition of danger in the capital itself, rendered it imprudent to despoil Lisbon of troops to any great extent. On the contrary, every exertion was made to put the forts of the Tagus into a state of complete preparation to repel the expected attack. But all efforts were greatly weakened by the want of money under a government which had long ago lost every particle of credit, and all whose proceedings had tended only to impoverish the country. In the month of November, a royal decree ordered a forced loan, amounting to about 240,000*l.*, which was to bear 5 per cent interest, and to be levied according to the means of those who were subjected to it. Two thirds were to be raised in Lisbon, and the remaining third in Oporto, Figueira, and Coimbra.



A commission was appointed to assess the value of each individual's income, and the whole amount was to be paid into the treasury within twelve days.

ITALY. The vacancy of the papal throne occasioned by the death of Pius VII. in December of the preceding year, was not filled up till the beginning of February, when the conclave elected as his successor Cardinal Mauro Capellari. The new pope was an Italian by birth, had belonged to a monastic order, had received the Cardinal's hat in 1826, and had been a popular candidate, at least with the citizens of Rome, at the election in 1828. He assumed the title of Gregory XVI. The first intelligence that reached him after his election was that of great part of his states being in successful revolt against the authority of the tiara which he had just put on.

There was no part of Europe to which the revolutionary party in France looked with more longing eyes than Italy. It was an object of national ambition to expel the Austrians from Lombardy; to encourage the Italian states in rebellion against even their native sovereigns was part of their creed in favour of the cause of insurrection all over the globe. Ever since the revolution of July, their emissaries had been busily employed in collecting and fanning the sparks of discontent. A conspiracy had gradually been formed against the existing governments, which was to explode on various points at the same time, and the result of which was to be the union of the different states, under republican governments, and an Italian federation. The attempt was hopeless, if Austria were allowed to act

against it; but the conspirators trusted that the French government would prevent, and by its principles was bound to prevent, any armed interference between princes and their subjects. They even declared that they had acted on the assurances of a French minister to that effect; and there was no doubt that they had received all manner of encouragement and assurances from the leaders of the movement party at Paris, who, although not the government, were led by their vanity to believe that they could compel the government to adopt their own principles of the propagation of insurrection.

The conspiracy broke out first at Modena on the 3rd of February. On that day a number of young men had assembled in arms at the house of a citizen named Menotti, who was at the head of the design, to arrange their final measures. The police having learned what was going on, the house was surrounded by military. The conspirators barricaded the doors, and firing from the windows, defended themselves vigorously, trusting to some popular movement in their favour. Cannon were at last brought up, and then they surrendered to the number of thirty, among whom was Menotti himself. The plot seemed to have failed: but the calm was only momentary; for, the branch of the conspiracy, which had been laid in the papal states, having proved completely successful at the neighbouring Bologna, the infection of example, and the certainty of support, restored the courage of the Modenese plotters, and they again raised a much more general popular movement. It instantly extended to Reggio. The duke, thinking him-



self unsafe at Modena, retired with his family to Mantua, having first appointed a council of regency, and carrying along with him the conspirator Menotti. The insurgents were now triumphant. The regency was compelled to take to flight; the palace was plundered; the custom houses on the frontiers towards Parma and the Papal states suppressed, and a provisional government established, at the head of which were a dictator and three consuls.

In Bologna, a city which had a garrison of only 700 men with a population of 60,000 inhabitants, the insurrection broke out on the 4th of February. The conspirators who first shewed themselves were principally young men, who were immediately joined by numbers of the students of that famed university. The archbishop-legate being absent at Rome attending the conclave for the election of the pope, the pro-legate hastily assembled the principal nobility, and the most eminent citizens, to consult on the dangers that threatened them. While he was deliberating with them, about midnight, the young men advanced in arms towards the palace. The pro-legate had already given orders to the little garrison to remain passive, from a fear that military aid would be of no avail, as the conspiracy was so widely extended; and the conspirators, who were prepared for a serious resistance, did not find even a sentinel on duty at the palace. They required the pro-legate to sign a paper, by which he resigned the administration to a provisional government. He at first refused, but the increasing tumult without doors, and the threat to throw him out of the window, if he persisted in his

refusal, obliged him to yield to the demands of the insurgents. By this document all the troops of the Legation were placed under the provisional government. On the following day (Feb. 5), the pro-legate and the dismissed colonel of the troops of the line set out with an escort to Florence. A provisional government was installed; the authority of the pope as a temporal sovereign was declared to be at an end; and the people were called on to form themselves into a national guard for the defence of their newly acquired liberties. The success of the enterprise at Bologna was the signal for similar, and equally successful risings, throughout all the legations from Bologna to Ancona. In all the principal towns the papal soldiers, who have never been famed for deeds of valour, submitted at once, or were speedily disarmed. Even the Austrian garrison of Ferrara, shutting itself up in the citadel, opposed no resistance to the insurrection. Ancona, with its citadel, threatening some opposition, what was called an army was sent against it by the insurgents. They had scarcely appeared, when it capitulated. In the course of four days the power of the pope on the north of the Appenines was at an end. The insurgents even entered the Appenines, as if intending to march upon Rome; and as their forces were organized pushed forward their advanced detachments as far as Otricoli. But no movement took place in the capital, and the fortune that awaited them elsewhere soon deprived them of all desire to proceed. The example of Bologna, Modena, and Reggio, was followed by Parma on the 10th of February. A deputation of insurgents waited on the duchess,



and civilly informed her it was necessary she should withdraw, as they intended to join the Italian federation, and would have no farther occasion for any other government. Her highness refused; but was told that her carriages and escort were already in waiting. No alternative being left, since force was to be used, she made a virtue of necessity, and took her departure for Piacenza. Her departure was followed by the convocation of a civic congress, consisting of 90 persons, and the installation of a provisional government. Similar scenes were apprehended in Tuscany and Piedmont; and the insurrectionists employed all their means to render the conflagration general; but these countries, as well as the whole of Austrian Lombardy, remained tranquil.

It was on the conduct of Austria that the fate of the insurrection in a great measure depended, yet its leaders had the madness to do what was equivalent to declaring war against her. Not satisfied with working on the field which they had cleared, they resolved to incite Austrian Lombardy, and even Naples, to revolt, as necessary parts of their intended federation. From Bologna, which was now tacitly regarded as the head of the enterprize, went forth a proclamation to the "Brave patriots of Lombardy," summoning them to rise against the Austrian yoke. "Fellow-countrymen of Lombardy," it was there said, "follow the example of France—imitate the patriots of central Italy—burst asunder the degrading chains which the Holy Alliance has rivetted upon you. We were slaves, and wretched under the despotism of priests, but our oppressors were still Italians. You are the slaves

of foreigners, who enrich themselves by despoiling you, and render you daily more miserable. On the day of your rising, 40,000 of our patriots will march to assist you in crushing the Austrians. Let there be no delay, for there is danger in hesitation. Display your courage, fellow-countrymen, and despotism will flee from our country. Our country, liberty, and national independence for ever!" A similar exhortation was addressed to the subjects of Naples. "In 1820 you won your liberty, and obtained a constitution without bloodshed. Your king, and all the civil and military authorities, swore to observe it, but treachery and perjury have deprived you of it. The enlightened nations have represented you as having lost your constitution by your cowardice. Avenge the national honour; do not suffer yourselves to be deceived by fallacious promises and amnesties which are only snares. To arms! Neapolitan patriots: shake off the yoke; become free again, for you have it in your power."

Austria required no such provocation to induce her to put down a system, the existence of which, on the south of the Po, was scarcely compatible with the existence of her own power on the north of it. She had never considered Italy secure from even more direct attempts on the part of France, after the revolution of 1830, and had filled Lombardy with nearly 100,000 men. Her means, therefore, were abundant. His holiness the pope, the emperor's own daughter the duchess of Parma, and the exiled duke of Modena, all demanded the aid of the imperial arms against their rebellious subjects. France, on the other hand, had declared that she would



not permit Austrian troops to interfere in any quarrel between an Italian prince and his subjects. The French minister, however, afterwards explained, that this was not intended to bind France to take any measures to prevent such interference—certainly the only meaning which the Italian insurgents could have attached to it. They clearly had speculated upon this, that they would not have Austria against them, without having the whole power of France behind him. France, however, could not have marched an army, except through Switzerland or Piedmont; and a forced march through either of these countries would have been an aggression revolting to all Europe. The court of Sardinia, being naturally ruled by Austrian, rather than by French influence, made extensive military preparations, which the violent party in France employed as a reason for trying to compel their government to pick a quarrel with Sardinia, because she only did what was justified by every word they uttered, and every measure they recommended.

The negotiations between France and Austria seemed to have terminated in this, that the latter should march into the disturbed districts to put down the insurrection, but should not continue to occupy them. The Austrian troops crossed the Po in the beginning of March. One division proceeded to Parma and Modena, while baron Frimont, the commander-in-chief, advanced at the head of about 20,000 men against Bologna. Not even an attempt at serious resistance was made. The proud promises of the insurgents to defend to the last by their valour the liberty which they had

won by their machinations, were forgotten. The armies which were to spring up from the boasted enthusiasm of the people were no where to be found. Their leaders, instead of joining in any plan of action, began, as usually happens in such cases, to accuse each other of lukewarmness and treachery. The governments of Modena and Parma were instantly restored, and the restoration was not followed by more punishment than those who stake their lives on such a venture ought to reckon on. Menotti, the head of the Modenese insurrection, and who had been a prisoner during the whole period of even its ephemeral success, was executed, after a regular trial, along with another of his co-conspirators. The duchess of Parma granted a free pardon to all the persons who had attended the civic Congress which appointed the provisional government, only excluding them, for three years, from public offices. Two of the members of the provisional government itself were brought to trial, but were acquitted, and set at liberty. One of them had been president of the court of appeal before the revolution. The ground on which their judges acquitted them was said to be, that, as the duchess had retired from her states without delegating her authority to any regency, the civic Congress was warranted in providing and creating authorities for causing the laws to be respected; that it was an act of necessity, since without the establishment of a provisional government complete anarchy would have reigned.

It was at Bologna alone, that any demonstrations were made of opposing force to force. There the armed insurgents were more



numerous, and better organized; and they had amongst them the hottest heads of Italy, who had been assembled at Bologna to form a convention of deputies from the intended United Provinces. They had some of their troops at Ravenna, and others farther advanced towards the Po. As baron Frimont approached, they all retired without firing a shot. The papal government was re-established in Ferrara without opposition. The Austrians moved on without finding an enemy, and entered Bologna on the 21st of March. The convocation of deputies had dispersed; those who were in arms and did not throw them away, took the direction of Romagna. The Austrians followed, and the towns along the whole line of march surrendered, one after another. Some attempt at resistance was made between Rimini and Cattolica, but was speedily defeated. The armed insurgents had now remaining, of all their conquests, only Ancona; they were shut up in a corner from which there was no hope of escape; the Austrian army was close upon them. They endeavoured, therefore, to make terms with cardinal Benvenuto, whom they carried off from his residence at Osimo, in the commencement of the revolt, and had still detained as a prisoner in Ancona. The principal conditions which they demanded were, that none of the insurgents should be molested in person or property for what they had done; that those, who chose to leave the papal states, should have passports for that purpose, if demanded within a fortnight; that even such of them as had been in the pay of the papal government at the out-breaking of the revolution, should

sustain no injury in their rights for having joined the insurgents—which seemed to mean that they were to be allowed to keep their places; and that all foreigners, who had taken part with them, should be allowed to depart unmolested. In the document which contained these conditions, the heads of the revolt described themselves as “The members of the provisional government of the united Italian provinces.\*” On the 26th of March, the imprisoned cardinal put his name to these terms, and the insurrection, which four and twenty hours must have terminated at any rate, was at an end. The pope refused to ratify the convention, on the ground that

---

\* On the same day they put forth the following ‘notification by the provisional governments of the united Italian provinces.’—“A principle proclaimed by a great nation, which had solemnly promised not to permit its violation by any European Power, and the declaration of guarantee given by a minister of that nation, induced us to second the movement of the people of these provinces. All our efforts were directed to the far from easy task of maintaining order, amidst the agitation of an insurrection; and we experienced a pleasure most grateful to our hearts, in seeing the revolution conducted with all the tranquillity of a constitutional government, and, without shedding a single drop of blood.

“But the violation of this principle, consented to by the nation which had promulgated and guaranteed it, the impossibility of resisting a great Power which has already occupied part of the provinces with an armed force, and our wish to prevent bloodshed and disorder, are the circumstances which have induced us, with a view to the public safety, which ought always to be the supreme law of every state, to treat with his eminence the most reverend cardinal Gian Antonio Benvenuto, legate-a-latere of his holiness Gregory XVI., and to resign to him the government of these provinces, which has been accepted by his eminence under the subjoined conditions.”



it had been extorted from the cardinal by coercion when detained in durance by the rebels. A considerable number of the latter were arrested; and commissions appointed for their trial. The proceedings of these tribunals were to be confined to persons accused "of having signed the act of the pretended provisional government of Bologna, which dared to declare the abolition of the temporal power of the Roman pontiffs; or of having broken their military oath by enrolling themselves in the troops called national guards; or of having published irreligious and seditious writings, and especially of having signed the periodical journals of the rebellious provinces. To all other Roman subjects not included in the above classes, his holiness, by an act of his clemency, grants an entire and generous amnesty, in the hope that, repenting their faults, they will repair them by their attachment to the holy see." In no instance was a capital punishment inflicted. The French government interested itself for the defeated insurgents, and as a recompense for not having disturbed the operations of Austria, stipulated that his holiness should bestow upon his subjects some fiscal and administrative reform. Tranquillity, however, being now restored, they insisted on the withdrawal of the Austrian troops, who forthwith retired beyond the limits of the legations, the papal forces occupying their place.

On the 7th of July appeared an edict of the pope, dividing the papal state into delegations, and these again into communes, in each of which there was to be a communal council, to be elected two-thirds from among proprietors, including ecclesiastical proprietors,

and one-third from among literary men, merchants, and professors, and to be renewed every second year. Each delegation was to be under a delegate, who should exercise jurisdiction over all acts of administration. To the communal council was annually to be presented estimates of the receipts and expenses of the following year: and for a fixed time before the budget of the preceding year should be presented for examination, every citizen might investigate whether the public affairs were properly managed. The council was afterwards to examine the accounts, and transmit them to the delegate. Every year there was to be assembled in each delegation, a provincial council, composed of councillors in the proportion of one for a population of 20,000 souls, presented by the communal deputies, and approved by the pope. The provincial councils were to be renewed every second year; but the government might dissolve them, by ordaining a new election, and convoke them extraordinarily. The provincial councils were to assemble on the 1st of October next.

But these fiscal reforms gave no satisfaction to the agitating spirit which was abroad in the legations. The truth was, that the withdrawal of the Austrians, and the re-establishment of civic guards in the different towns, seemed about to produce a new explosion. In many places the pontifical officers were powerless; in others, the tricoloured flag was again hoisted, and the military resisted in attempting to pull it down. The papal army of five or six thousand men, advanced from Ancona as far as Rimini; the civic guards threatened to attack it, if its march



were continued. The agitators of the legations, emboldened by the interposition of France in their favour after the suppression of the insurrection, held Conferences, and sent deputations, as if they had been independent of Rome.

Amid the confusion of Italy, Charles Joseph, king of Sardinia, died on the 27th of April, in the eleventh year of his reign. Although not distinguished by any brilliant quality, he was a popular prince among his own people. He was succeeded by his nephew, Charles Albert, prince of Carignan, who had once been a liberal. In the Piedmontese revolution of 1821, he had been placed at the head of the provisional government, and took the oath to the exotic constitution of the Spanish Cortes, the only one which happened at the time to be ready for use. On the suppression of the revolt, he joined the Duc d'Angoulême to fight against the Cortes and their Constitution in Spain. His most active associates in the insurrection of 1821 had been driven into exile; the royal amnesty did not reach them. They hoped that, as king, he would now recal those who had shared in his errors as prince. But he seemed to think that to do so, especially at such a moment, would naturally only expose his own crown to the same danger with which he and his advisers had threatened his uncle's, and satisfied himself with renewing the amnesty of his predecessor.

GREECE, for whose pacification the powers of Europe had laboured so long, was now a scene of violence and mortal civil war. The President Capo d'Istrias, whether from his too great attachment to

Russian interests, or from the mere jealousy and discontent of chiefs, all of them unused to control, and eager for power, had rapidly become unpopular. The opposition to him comprehended Miaulis, Maurocordato, Conduriottis, and many others of the most distinguished and popular leaders. They demanded the convocation of the national assembly, which he refused; they demanded the full establishment of the liberty of the press, to which he would not consent; and they accused him of violating every principle of their constitution by inflicting on his opponents arbitrary imprisonment and exile, and ruling, by the assistance of his army, like the despotic deputy of Russia, not as the elected head of a free state. Among others, Pietro Mauroichaeli, the Bey of Maina, one of the most constant and least selfish of the Greek leaders throughout the whole period of the insurrection, was still lingering in prison at Napoli di Romania. The discontents propagated by these leaders, gradually undermined the president's authority, particularly in the islands, and broke out in open resistance to his government. In the month of April, Maina, the native territory of the captive Mauroichaeli, threw off its allegiance, and established a local government. Its example was immediately followed by Hydra, the most important of the islands, which effected its revolution with much order, and thus deprived the fleet of its best seamen. It subjected itself to a provisional government at the head of which were Miaulis and Conduriottis. These new authorities demanded of the president the convocation of the national assembly—a constitution—the freedom of the press—and the



examination of the accounts. None of these things would the president concede. Addresses, requesting the convocation of this so much desired national assembly, poured in from all sides,—from Poros, Syra, and other islands of the Archipelago, and, on the mainland, from different places both of the Morea and Rumelia. The president, whether apprehensive that such a body would shake his own power, or be hostile to the interests of Russia, retained his determination and multiplied arrests.

The *Hellas*, the only frigate which Greece possessed, and the rest of their fleet, lay at Poros. It was discovered, or, at least, was believed, that the president was preparing to embark on board of it an expedition against the islands which had thrown off his authority, or condemned his government. The provisional government of Hydra resolved to deprive him of the means. In the end of July, they sent between two and three hundred men during the night to Poros, who boarded and took possession of the *Hellas*. Miaulis followed next day, with a reinforcement, and took under his orders all the vessels in the harbour of Poros. The inhabitants of the town received them as deliverers and espoused their cause. The president made the foreign residents at Napoli address a note to him expressing their disapprobation of these insurrectionary movements, and their hope that, in the absence of the commander of the French and English squadrons, this declaration would bring back the chiefs who had taken part in the revolt to their duty. This was too weak an expedient, and the president despatched the Russian fleet to Poros, while he prepared

to combine, with the attack of the latter, a movement of his own troops against the town. Miaulis refused to surrender the fleet at the summons of the Russian admiral M. Ricord, who now blockaded Poros. A Greek vessel, coming from Syra with provisions, was sunk by the Russians, and in return a Russian brig of war was fired into by one of the Greek Corvettes. In the mean time 1,200 men of the president's troops had arrived to attack Poros. These men soon got possession of the watering place on the side of the main land; and, passing over in Russian boats, and assisted by Russian soldiers, they made themselves masters of the watering place at the monastery also: the Russians in the mean time having erected four batteries, which they worked against the town, and from which they fired even upon the women and children going to endeavour to get water. Poros had not above 500 men to defend it; yet the attack failed, the Russians and the president's troops being driven back with a heavy loss of men, several officers being killed, with about 100 men, and some of the Russian boats with troops in them sunk. But the want of water and the total failure of provisions rendered it impossible to hold out the town. The fleet was in the same condition. Boats were brought over from Hydra, which conveyed to that island the population of Poros, who, rather than await the tender mercies of the Russians and the president's troops, quitted their homes and their property. Miaulis, likewise, sent back his seamen to Hydra, retaining only a handful of men to execute the design which he had formed. On the 13th of August the Russian fleet weighed, to stand



in and attack the Greek ships, while the president's army again advanced against the town. Miaulis and his half dozen seamen were seen to take to their boat as the Russian squadron drew near; and within a few minutes after he had quitted the Hellas, the frigate, and the other armed vessels in the harbour, blew up. The old admiral, having sent them into the air, rather than allow them to fall into the hands of Russia or the president, found his way back to Hydra. The troops of Capo d' Istrias then entered the town, which—a city of their countrymen—they reduced to a heap of ashes.

The Mainotes, on the other hand, acted against the government by land. Descending from their mountains, they drove the government troops from Calamata, on the gulph of Coron, where they retaliated in some measure, by their pillage, the destruction with which Poros had been visited. The president reinforced his army; but the French troops in the neighbourhood took possession of the town, to prevent the parties from coming to blows. A squadron of small Hydriote vessels, which had accompanied the operations of the Mainotes was lying in the gulph. A French frigate, too, was there, and gave them no disturbance. But the Russian admiral came round from Poros, stood into the gulph, and summoned them to surrender. Instead of submitting, the Hydriotes blew up the largest of their vessels, and ran the others ashore, with the exception of one which escaped. Throughout all these dissensions, the Russians alone were the active allies of the president. The English and French commanders strove to mediate be-

tween the parties; and the president's obstinacy, coupled with the Russian's violence, increased the belief that a Russian interest was at stake.

From the commencement of these troubles, and particularly after the arming of the Mainotes, whose Bey, Mauromichaeli, had been imprisoned since the month of January, the president had received various warnings that his life was in danger. He disregarded them, and the blow was struck. George, the son, and Constantine, the brother, of the Bey, repaired to Napoli di Romania for the purpose of assassinating the head of the government. On the 9th of October they lurked for him at the door of the church which they had learned he was to visit. On the threshold of the temple they attacked him. The one discharged a pistol at his head; the other stabbed him with a dagger. The president fell dead upon the spot. The deed was perpetrated under the very eyes of the people. One of the assassins, Constantine, was immediately put to death by the by-standers; George escaped into the house of the French consul, who refused to give him up to the fury of the military or the rabble, but promised to surrender him on a regular demand being made by the magistracy. The crime seemed to have been the result of private revenge rather than of political hostility. It produced no immediate political consequence, much less any violent convulsion. The Senate immediately named a commission of government, consisting of Colocotroni, Coletti, and Augustin Capo d' Istrias, the president's brother, the latter of whom was placed at its head.



## CHAP. XV.

UNITED STATES—SOUTH AMERICA—*State of Brazil—Disturbances at Rio Janeiro—The Emperor abdicates in favour of his son.* BUENOS AYRES—*Military operations—*COLOMBIA—*Death of Bolivar—Insurrection in Panama—*MEXICO—PERU. *Disturbances at Lima.*

IN the Congress of the United States, the tariff of duties on importation, of which the commercial states, and the producers of exportable productions had never ceased to complain, was again made the subject of discussion. The President, in his message, had expressed himself favourable to a re-examination of its principles, or even a modification of some of its provisions. That part of the message had been referred by the House of Representatives to a committee. The report was hostile to any alteration or modification of the existing tariff, the committee expressing their belief, that, “the tariff having been so recently revised, any attempt to change its provisions, at this time, would spread alarm among the great interests of our country,—shake confidence in the plighted faith of government,—destroy the supposed well-founded hopes of millions of our fellow-citizens, reduce them to penury, and expose the whole country to the dangers of ‘a most selfish policy which might be adopted by foreign nations.’” The minority of the committee, according to the modern usage of the Congress, published a counter-report, in which they took a view of the question respecting the tariff diametrically opposite to that taken by the majority. A convention of deputies from fifteen states, who had been appointed to procure, if possible,

an alteration, likewise put forth a long report, denouncing the tariff as being at once injurious, unjust, and unconstitutional.

BRAZIL, at length followed the example which had been so long and so repeatedly held out to it by the rest of South America, and indulged in a revolution. The emperor had closed the ordinary session of the assembly in the preceding September, in no happy humour with its proceedings. An extraordinary session was convoked immediately afterwards. But its proceedings were not much more satisfactory. A committee, having been appointed to investigate the conduct of the late and present ministers of war, reported both of them to have issued orders for recruiting without an act of the legislature; and another committee was immediately named to prepare an impeachment against them for violating the constitution. The emperor had recommended the state of the finances and the circulating medium to their particular attention. A multitude of projects for ameliorating both had been presented to Congress by different members, and had been referred to a committee, to select, or combine, the scheme which might appear most expedient. The committee reported, that, considering the facts which had lately occurred—the purchase of copper blanks to coin,



when the general voice cried out against such a measure—the arrival of arms from London, when the nation was enjoying the blessings of peace—the loan of 400,000*l.* for illegal purposes—the retaining of some public officers, and the nomination of others professed enemies to the constitution—and above all, the general suspicion of the existence of a secret administration, independent of the ostensible and constitutional one, had caused the greatest general mistrust of the present ministry, they could not propose under existing circumstances, any measure calling upon the nation for fresh sacrifices, from the fear that through mal-administration they would be misapplied, and converted to the prejudice of the people and their rights. The two houses of Congress likewise, quarrelled with each other, in consequence of certain alterations made by the senate in the bill fixing the income and expenditure of the year. The deputies refused to accede to these alterations, and demanded, as the constitution provided in the event of a disagreement between the two houses, that both chambers should meet in one. The senate consisting of only 30 members, while the deputies were 80, the former was always averse to this mode of proceeding, and now requested that the bill should be sent back, in order that they might take their amendments into further consideration. The deputies refused—insisted on their constitutional privilege—and carried their point. The Emperor closed this unpleasant session on the 30th of November, expressing his regret that the most pressing matters had been left where they were.

There was thus abundance of irritation and want of confidence a

state of things which had been in a great measure produced, and was still more effectually kept alive, by the consequences of the events in Portugal during the three preceding years. When Don Pedro made his choice between the throne of Brazil and that of Portugal, he had carried along with him to his transatlantic possessions a host of European friends and attendants. The reverses of the constitutional party, which drove so many Portuguese into exile, and an exile aggravated by poverty, increased their numbers, and their demands upon the emperor's purse. The pride of the native Brazilians was wounded by seeing the king and his government almost exclusively, as they alleged, in the hands of foreigners; towards foreigners against whom they were thus irritated, they could not be expected to entertain very generous feelings, and they complained, therefore, that, while their finances were confessedly in confusion, money was expended on aliens to the state. They found a still more tangible ground of similar complaint in the alleged appropriation of Brazilian funds to support the claims of Don Pedro's daughter against his brother Miguel. The funds, which the Brazilian government had set apart for the payment of the dividends on its acknowledged debt in England, were appropriated by the envoys of the emperor for the support of his daughter's rights; and the country, which supplies us with precious metals and precious stones, became bankrupt on the exchange of London, because the emperor's daughter was obliged to send an expedition to Oporto, and to support a regency at Terceira. This was not the only expenditure to which the



unfortunate issue of his affairs in Europe compelled the emperor. His daughter was recalled from Europe, and established as queen of Portugal in a palace at Rio Janeiro, with a court and court pageantry of her own, out of the Brazilian Budget. All these things were daily exposed to the irritated public mind. The press never ceased to harangue on the incapacity of ministers—the misapplication of the English loan—the war against Buenos Ayres—the yoke of the Portuguese party—the luxury and immorality of the court and courtiers.

The emperor returned to Rio Janeiro, from a tour in the provinces in the middle of March, and was received with every apparent testimony of loyalty and affection. On the 13th, an affray, attended with bloodshed, had occurred between the Portuguese and the Brazilians. On the 15th of March, at the solemn entry of the emperor, the excesses were continued. Some of the persons, who accompanied him on horseback, committed various insolent acts, threatening the citizens with their whips if they did not cry out “Long live the emperor,” “Death to the republic.” The police were accused of conniving at the rioters, and the conviction of the generality of the Brazilians was, that the whole was caused by the influence and under the auspices of the agents of the executive.

In consequence of these events, twenty-four members of the Chamber of Deputies presented to the emperor, on the 17th, a remonstrance which announced loudly and vigorously the state of public feeling. They stated that the rejoicings in honour of his majesty’s return had been converted into an

occasion “of insulting and maltreating the Brazilians—friends of liberty and the country—who were, in fact, covered with opprobrium by the Lusitanian party, which has again arisen in the midst of us, with cries of “Live the Portuguese,” and of committing seditious and anarchical acts and outrages of every description, of which the victims have been patriots whose blood has been shed by a perfidious and premeditated aggression by men who, in all the delirium of their crimes, have been clearly protected by the government and subaltern authorities, of which they themselves boast, thus compromising with incredible audacity the august and respectable name of your imperial and constitutional majesty. The seditious continue, under the shade of the august name of your imperial and constitutional majesty, to prosecute their dark designs. The outrages increase, national spirit suffers, and no people could tolerate without resistance, that foreigners should impose upon them in their own country an ignominious yoke. Foreigners who have the honour of being the subjects of Don Miguel, others who are the subjects of the Senhora Donna Maria II., chiefly composed those groups which, in the nights of the 13th and 14th, vilified the Brazilian name, and alarmed and wounded many of our fellow-citizens. The Brazilians so cruelly offended—the Brazilians, who are threatened with partial and unjust imprisonments—cherish in their breasts the most well-founded and profound indignation, the consequences of which it is impossible to calculate, if the government do not henceforth repress similar disorders, and take measures to redress as far as pos-



sible the insult which the nation has received. Circumstances are urgent, and the least delay may, in such a case, be fatal. The confidence, which ought to be placed in the Government, is almost entirely extinguished, and if the aggressions against which the undersigned make this representation should remain unpunished, such neglect will amount to a declaration that it is for the Brazilian people themselves to avenge, by the means in their own power, the stain so unworthily cast on their honour and high character."

To this address the emperor returned an answer next day, declaring that measures had been adopted to maintain order and tranquillity. He dismissed likewise the greater part of his ministers, but the successors whom he named turned out to be still more unpopular. Even a decree issued on the 3rd of April for convoking an extraordinary meeting of Congress failed to soothe the public mind. The people—led, no doubt, by persons who contemplated more than a change of ministry—refused to be satisfied, till they saw the throne surrounded with different counselors. A perpetual cry was kept up against the expenses of the court, and the insolence of the Portuguese—or what the Brazilian reformers called, by terms coined for the occasion, *Aulismo* and *Lusitanismo*. The people were flattered with the title of *Povo heroico*, and reminded of the late popular insurrections of Europe, with their results on public liberty. As in France and Belgium, the representatives of the nation, the public press, and the most stirring spirits of the capital, were for a change; and, acted upon by the united force of these bodies, the

army could not long remain faithful. The emperor was repeatedly summoned, but in vain, to surrender his ministry. The disaffection broke out into open tumult, and threatened the palace. He called on his guards to act against the populace, but, with the exception of a very small number, they laid down their arms, or joined their fellow-citizens. The emperor then issued a proclamation announcing, in brief terms, that he abdicated the crown in favour of his son Don Pedro, and next day, the 7th of April, embarked with his family on board a British frigate, leaving behind him the young emperor, to whom he had named one of his friends guardian. His daughter, the queen of Portugal, was received, at the same time, on board a French frigate, and both proceeded forthwith to Europe.

The departure of the emperor having left the country without a government, all the members of the Chamber of Deputies, who were in Rio, collected hastily together, to deliberate on the proper course to be pursued. They determined to appoint a regency, to be composed of three individuals of their own body. The persons elected were, Francisco de Lima, the marquis of Caravellas, and Vergueino. They immediately took upon themselves the supreme power, and appointed a ministry. Their first act was to issue a decree, in the name of the new emperor, declaring that all persons who had been condemned for political offences, or were even accused, were thereby pardoned. This was followed by the performance of a solemn *Te Deum*, by order of the Regency, to render thanks to heaven for the departure of Pedro I., and the accession of Pedro II. As yet nobody seemed



inclined to question the boy's rights.

The Congress assembled on the 3rd of May, and a speech was delivered by the regency of the son, congratulating the country on the removal of his father, which was described as the removal of ignorance, and undue intrigue and influence. The army was kept up at the number which had been voted for the preceding year, and a civic guard was organized for the preservation of order, which was found to be by no means restored by the absence of the causes which had disturbed it. This civic guard itself led to serious disturbances in the month of July, in consequence of a spirit of hostility entertained against it by the lower orders, and a portion of the troops. On the 12th the people rose in a body, and insisted on the civic guard being immediately disarmed and broken up, requesting, at the same time that the old police system should be re-established. Some of the government troops were employed to put down the rebels, and several actions were fought in the streets. Considerable slaughter on both sides took place, but the government troops ultimately succeeded in securing the principal rioters, and in restoring order. The civic guard, however, was disbanded, and those of the troops that had taken part with the populace were sent off to Bahia.

In BUENOS AYRES the war between the capital and the interior provinces still continued, leading to a multitude of pigmy military operations, and interrupting all peaceful pursuits. The fortune of the campaign, however, which towards the close of the preceding year had been in favour of the

Unitarians, became more favourable to the Federalists. General Lavalle, who had been driven from Buenos Ayres on the triumph of the latter party, effected a landing at Estremadura, but was immediately defeated, and his forces dispersed. The Federalists were equally successful against the forces of Jordan in Entre-rios; the Unitarians were dispossessed of the government of that province, and the preponderance of Buenos Ayres restored. Paez, too, who had maintained against the capital the province of Cordova, was worsted by general Lopez; while Quiroga, pursuing the Unitarians, as they fell back towards the Andes, gained, over them and their allied Indians, a succession of advantages. These events, trifling in themselves, promised to prepare the way for a more tranquil state of things; and although nothing like a solid peace reigned throughout the Argentine republic, the intercourse between the provinces became more regular and frequent, and those of Cordova and San Juan again entrusted to the governor of Buenos Ayres, the head of the Federalists, the conduct of their foreign relations, of which they had none.

In COLOMBIA, the only important event of the year, or rather of the conclusion of the preceding year was the death of Bolivar, whose name had been so long identified with that portion of the South American Continent. On withdrawing from public affairs, after the adoption of the new constitution in the preceding year, he had retired to the province of Carthagena, broken down both in body and mind; and he expired at Santa Martha on the 17th of December. It was vain to deny, that in the



struggle which Colombia had to maintain in working out her independence, she owed much to him whom she designated her Liberator. Among a people where ignorance was universal, his superior acquirements, such as they were, backed by his ambition and his large fortune, soon raised him to an ascendancy among the adventurers of independence. He was enthusiastic in the great cause of throwing off the yoke of the mother country; he was therefore trusted, and worthy of being entrusted. Probably no other native could so successfully have kept together, till the contest was over, the materials with which he had to operate. The liberation of the extensive provinces composing the republic, and their union into one state—the organization of its government, and the establishment of its political relations with foreign states, were, in a great measure, his work. But his qualities as a statesman to govern the country during peace, fell infinitely below his qualifications to secure her independence by war. His political institutions were founded on vague and hazy ideas, whose origin was to be sought any where but in experience. Even in his own time the building was falling in pieces around him. Whether he really entertained the ambition which was imputed to him of aiming at supreme and royal authority, may be doubtful; but the belief of his entertaining such designs, widely spread and firmly rooted, produced as much mischief, as if it had been true. He went down to the grave complaining that he had been hunted into it by calumniators. On the 10th of December, a week before his death, he put forth his last address to the citizens of the republic: “Columbians,—You have aided me in con-

centrating my forces to cherish liberty where tyranny had fixed its abode. I have unceasingly and disinterestedly exerted my energies for your welfare. I have even abandoned my fortune and my personal tranquillity in your cause. My enemies abuse your credulity, and endeavour to destroy my reputation by questioning my love of liberty; and, fellow-citizens, I grieve to say it, I am the victim of my persecutors, who have now conducted me almost to my grave; but I pardon them. My affection for my country will not permit me to sanction any extraordinary funeral obsequies. My last desire, my last hope, is to see the consolidation of my beloved country. Let all unite for the good of the union; let the people confide in the actual government to save them from anarchy; let the priests offer up their orisons to heaven, and the soldier regard his sword as the best guarantee for preserving the institutions of his country.

“Columbians,—I leave you: but my last prayers are offered up for the tranquillity of Columbia, and if my death will contribute to this desirable end, by a discontinuance of party feeling, and consolidate the union, I shall descend with feelings of contentment into the tomb which will soon be prepared for me.”

The consequences of his death, when past dissensions were for a time partially stilled, and the government for a while had been going on without him, were less momentous, than if he had disappeared when the whole unity of the machine depended on his single person. The reins of authority were no doubt loosely held, but so they had long been. The provinces began again to talk of changing their constitutions, but there



was nothing in South America which had any idea of permanence attached to it. An insurrection was got up in Panama, for the purpose of separating it from the rest of the republic ; but in that it only followed the example of other provinces. The insurrection was headed by general Urduneta, and countenanced by Lucque who commanded in Carthagena. Flores marched from Bogota against the insurgents, routed their forces, and having taken their leaders prisoners, put them to death.

MEXICO presented, during the year, no event of importance, except the rare occurrence that it was not visited by a revolution. Bustamente and his party, who had raised themselves, in 1830, on the ruins of Guerrero and Santana, maintained their ascendancy. Guerrero himself was betrayed into their hands, and the flying hostilities kept up by some of his partisans, were repressed by the operations of general Bravo.

PERU, was less tranquil, in consequence of a military intrigue to dispossess La Fuente of the vice-presidency, during the absence of the president Guerrero. The plot was said to have been the work of Guerrero's own wife, who apprehended that the vice-president was undermining her husband. A part of the garrison forced their way into the house of La Fuente while he was in bed. The general sprang up undressed, made his way past several of the soldiers, and by the

assistance of a servant escaped up a kitchen chimney, to the flat roof of the house. The officer nearest in pursuit was shot dead by one of his own party, the ball being probably intended for La Fuente. The mutineers then returned to their barracks, carrying off as captives two or three friends and an aid-de-camp. The city now resounded with the cry of 'revolution.' General Miller rode to La Fuente's house. Having ascertained what had passed, he repaired to the barracks of three companies whom La Fuente, not altogether ignorant of what was intended, had brought up from Callao for his protection a few days before. Miller, however, finding the revolt too powerful, retreated to Callao. When he arrived there, he found that the garrison was on the same side with that of Lima, and he was refused admittance. He then took possession, with his three companies, of a dismantled fort, while a fresh body of the mutineers from Lima was admitted into the castle. Rather than commence a contest which appeared hopeless, general Miller agreed to have an interview with general Benavides, who had joined the revolutionists. The result was, that the officers, who had accompanied general Miller, were allowed to return to Lima ; the troops were allowed to join the garrison in the castle ; and the general himself, at his own request, received permission to go on board a North American ship. Reyes, the president of the Congress, was placed, in the meantime, at the head of the executive.



# CHRONICLE.

---

JANUARY.

## 1. MACHINE BREAKING.

—SPECIAL COMMISSION AT SALISBURY.—James Blandford, *aged* 28; Samuel Barrett, 30; R. Pitman, 29; James Mould, of Tisbury, 23; Samuel Banstone, 41; Thomas Vining, 19; James Mould, of Hatch, 39; Thomas Topp, 20; Samuel Eyres, 30; Thomas Rixen, 45; Edmund White, 20; John Barrett, 24; Charles Jerrard, 20; William Snook, 22; Thomas Birt, John Targett, and Andrew Moxam, 23, were charged with having riotously and tumultuously assembled, and broken and destroyed the thrashing-machine of John Benett, esq., at Pyt-house-farm, in the parish of Tisbury, on the 25th of November last.

John Benett, esq., M.P., examined by Mr. Serjeant Wilde.—I reside at Pyt-house, in the parish of Tisbury. Was in the county of Wilts on the 25th of November. In consequence of information which I received, I left my house about nine or ten o'clock in the morning of that day. I rode out and met upwards of 400 persons coming from the town of Hindon, at a lime-kiln, in Fonthill Giffard. They carried hatchets, hammers, very large sticks, and weapons of different descriptions. The sticks were general, the axes were confined to forty or fifty persons. I met Charles Jerrard the elder, who

VOL. LXXIII.

is not in custody; he wore a party-coloured sash across his body, and carried a very large stick. Charles Jerrard the younger was similarly equipped. I spoke to them both. I inquired of the mob their object. I spoke first to the elder Jerrard; he had often been before me as a magistrate. I spoke to him with firmness and good temper, and as loudly as I could speak. I told him that I was very sorry to see him at the head of such a riotous assembly, and warned him that he was placing himself in greater danger than any that he had ever been in before. I spoke then to the younger Jerrard. I said to him, "I am sorry to see you with that sash on. I entreat you to get into the rear, for an example will be made of some of you, and I should be sorry to see so young a man as you in a sad scrape." I said to him, "Young man, that sash will hang you." He came up with a large stick to my horse, and said to me, "I don't care about hanging." I then asked them what they complained of? They told me that they were going to break all the thrashing-machines in the county, and that they would have 2s. a day for wages. That was the general cry of the whole party; it was said by more than 100 persons. I told them that I had just come from London—that

B



a proclamation from the king had come out only a day before. I offered to read it to them, but they would not let me. I explained its nature. I told them that it offered a reward of 50*l.* for every man detected in breaking a machine, and of 500*l.* for the discovery of any person who should set fire to property. They said, "We don't burn—we have nothing to do with the fires." I replied, that I was quite convinced that they did not, and I really feel that conviction. I then pointed out to them that they could not trust each other, "for any man," I said, "by informing against ten of you, will obtain at once 500*l.*" I told them, that if they would go home and preserve their own lives and the peace of the district, I would take care, as far as depended on me, that they should procure by their good conduct all that others might obtain by their misconduct. The first body then left me, and went to their work of destruction. The mob passed me in three divisions. I spoke to each of them. When they passed me, I followed them. They stopped at Mr. Candy's farm, in Fonthill Giffard. They rushed into a blacksmith's shop; but before that, I saw them break Mr. Candy's thrashing-machine to pieces. I rode along-side the mob for a mile and a half, until they came to a Mr. Lampert's house, at Lawnorm. In consequence of something that occurred there, I sent to my own premises at Pyt-house-farm. The mob, consisting of 500 persons, afterwards came to me there. I can only identify Blandford as being present with the mob at Pyt-house-farm. I had observed him breaking machines before, at Mr. Lampert's farm. I had a thrashing-machine at Pyt-house-farm: it is worked

by six horses. Part of it is in the barn, part of it is out. I rode out of the farm-yard to meet the mob. I told them that my force was not sufficient to resist them, but that I would punish them if they broke into my premises. I told them, "You break open these barns at your peril; they are locked. I would resist you if I could; I cannot; but mind, you break the machines without my consent, and at your peril." All who were near my premises must have heard what I then said. They then forced their way into the barn. They broke the machine, which was both inside and outside of it, and began to pull off part of the roof. I remained about ten minutes with them, sitting quietly on my horse. On a sudden the whole party at work stopped: that surprised me, and immediately afterwards I received a blow on my head, which deprived me of sense for a short time. How it was given me, whether by a stick or a stone, I cannot say of my own knowledge. When I recovered, I found myself about fifty yards off my yard in the lane, entangled in a team of my own cart-horses. My horse had carried me out of the yard into that lane, and would have carried me home, if he had not been stopped. I then found stones coming in every direction at me from the mob. I was with that mob for three hours. During that time I saw them break machines at three places before they came to my barn.—Several other witnesses were examined, who fully proved the case, except against White and Moxam. Some of the prisoners alleged in their defence, that they had been forced to join the mob; others, that, though present, they had done nothing; others, that they had been encouraged by the



farmers. The Jury found them all *Guilty*, except White and Moxam.

ARSON.—KINGSTON ASSIZES.  
—James Warner, labourer, was indicted for wilfully and maliciously setting fire to a flour-mill, at Albury, in the occupation of James Franks.—James Franks; I am a miller at Albury, and have a dwelling-house on the side of the road leading from Albury to Sheer. The mill is next to the dwelling-house, and the grounds of Mr. Smallpiece are nearly opposite. On the 13th of November I retired to bed about eleven o'clock at night, having previously ascertained that the premises were all right. About four o'clock next morning, I was awoken by a loud cracking noise, and upon getting out of bed, I discovered that the mill was on fire. I alarmed my two brothers and the servants, and proceeded to dress myself, and had just left my bedroom window, when I heard the report of a gun, and at the same moment the window was shattered to pieces. The blind was down, but I pulled it on one side and looked out. I then ran down stairs, and, on going out at the door, I saw a man running along Mr. Smallpiece's pleasure-grounds. He had on a brown round frock or jacket. It was light at the time, and I could see any person distinctly; the mill, which was then burning, made every object visible. The prisoner was in my service two years last October, and he lived at Albury-heath, about three-quarters of a mile from my house. Before this fire took place, my windows had been shot at three times. I had never any dispute with the prisoner about a horse, but I had accused him of having beaten my horse. I discharged

the prisoner because I had no work for him. From the pleasure-ground of Mr. Smallpiece to my window is about seventy feet. I was not able to distinguish whether the man whom I saw running wore a frock or a jacket. The prisoner was permitted to go at large until the next Tuesday, and, after he knew that suspicion attached to him, he might have gone away. He was apprehended at his own house. The mill was worked at all hours, and sometimes by candle-light.—Richard Tidy; I was in the employment of Mr. Franks when the prisoner was in his service. After he left, I met him, and he asked me how Mr. Franks's horse was. I inquired why he asked, and he replied, "Because Mr. Franks has been making a row, and saying I beat his horse," adding, "he'll get no good by it; he will get served out for it." I told Mr. Franks of this conversation.—Matthew Mansell; I saw the prisoner in company with two young men, named Moore and Challing, about seven o'clock on the evening in question. They were standing together near Mr. Bampton's shop in Guildford. The prisoner said, "Young men, I can tell you something for your good." He then patted his breast, and said he had got something there which every person was not going to know; and then he said that they should hear something to be talked of before night.—Three other witnesses confirmed the statement of this person.—Thomas Myon; I live at Sheer, and was at Guildford on the night of the 13th of November, and saw the prisoner there. He came to the Queen's-head, and we started together towards Albury, at twelve o'clock that night, and went as far as Mr. Drummond's park, about



four miles from Guildford, and about a quarter of a mile from Mr. Franks's mill, and we parted at Albury-park. I had about a quarter of a mile to go home, and it was two o'clock when I got home. The prisoner was able to walk: and, although he was tipsy, he appeared to know what he was about. —Cross-examined by Mr. Dowling; I have known the prisoner for eight or ten years. Before we parted, he said he had got a bad pain in his side, and did not know that he should be able to walk home. —Henry Franks; I am the prosecutor's brother, and slept at Albury on the night of the 13th of November, I was roused at four o'clock in the morning by an alarm of fire, and came down stairs immediately, and unfastened the front door. As I opened the door, I observed a man on the shrubbery side of Mr. Smallpiece's pales. —John Richardson; I am bailiff to Mr. Drummond, and know the prisoner at the bar. I went to his house on Sunday, the 14th of November, and saw him near the hog-sty talking to his wife. I heard him say, "I shall go and see how they get on at the fire." I then went up and told him he must go with me. He came with me, and in crossing the heath he said, "You have had one of your ricks on fire." I said that was not the case. He then said, "You have had a fire at the park." I told him no. He then said his wife told him that Portsmouth (one of Mr. Drummond's servants) had said he saw a man with a gun shoot a fire-ball into the rick. I said I had not heard of it. In crossing that part of the park from which he could see the smoke issuing from the fire, he turned his head and said, "You have had a fire in the vil-

lage." I told him that Mr. Franks's mill was burnt down to the ground. He then said, there had been several fires in Kent. I was then directed to go to the cottage of the prisoner, where I saw a frock hanging by the fire. It was wet below the elbow and on the side, and there was the mark of yellow sand on the hip. The other marks appeared like what comes off in shrubberies after rain or thaw. The frock was dark brown. I saw a gun hanging over the fire-place, and, upon examining it, I found the pan moist, and also the inside of the barrel. There was a mark on the steel, and some moss on the plate of the lock. The moss was fresh. The gun appeared to have been recently discharged. I brought the gun and frock to Mr. Drummond's, after which the prisoner took them back again. On the evening of the same day I went again to the prisoner's. He had the frock on then, and I told him he must take it off. I then took the gun from the same place where it was in the morning, and when I took the frock to Mr. Drummond's, I observed that the stains were not so visible. Part of the moss remained on the gun.—Several other witnesses were called to corroborate the main facts already deposed to.—The Jury found the prisoner *Guilty*, and he was sentenced to be hanged.

2. EARTHQUAKE.—NAPLES.—To-day, at three o'clock in the afternoon, a severe shock of an earthquake alarmed the inhabitants of Lago Negro, in the province of Bassilicata. It lasted twenty seconds. Almost all the buildings in the commune felt its effects. Ten houses were entirely destroyed. The church of the Capuchins, which adjoins their con-



vent, and is at the distance of a mile from the town, was also thrown down, and the remainder of the convent was left in a very dangerous state. It does not appear that any persons lost their lives, except an old woman, who was crushed by the fall of a house.

3. MACHINE BREAKING. — SALISBURY SPECIAL COMMISSION. — William Bartlett, *aged* 30; William Munday, 38; Joseph Beminster, 26; Richard Watley, 40; James House, 23; Samuel Harford, 22; Joseph Hunt, 20; Wm. Bevan, 30; William Farley, 27; Henry Potticary, 30; James Wheeler, 25; and William Smith, 33; were charged with having riotously and tumultuously assembled, and forcibly destroyed a thrashing-machine, the property of Ambrose Patient. — Ambrose Patient; On the 25th of November I had two thrashing-machines on my estate, but I had taken them down. One of them was placed near my house. I could have put them together again, if I had pleased. About 12 o'clock on the 25th of November, 300 persons, armed with sticks, and hammers and axes, and other weapons, came to my house. Several of them had in their hands parts of thrashing-machines. I saw all the prisoners but Bartlett in that mob. They were most of them agricultural labourers. When they came to my house, I went and met them. I knew that they wanted to break my machine, and I asked what reason they had for doing so. They gave no reason. Harford said, he had come to break it, and break it he would. He asked me where the cylinder was. I said that it was with the rest of the machine. I advised them not to break the machine. I told them that, if they did break it, they would repent it. They did not

mind this, and broke it all to pieces. I saw Wheeler very active with a coal-hammer beating the machine. I saw Potticary active in striking the machine. I saw all the rest of the prisoners, save Bartlett, crowding so thick about the machine, that I could not distinguish what each was doing. When I found that they were determined to break the machine, I went to my house where I had left my wife and children. They came after me to my house, and demanded beer and cider. I refused to give them any for a considerable time; but afterwards I gave them some, for my wife and children were much frightened. They said, that they had half-a-hogshead of cider from another farmer whose machine they had broken, and they must have it from me. I said that that was no reason why I should give them any. Whilst they were talking with me, Colonel A'Court came up. — Colonel Charles Ashe A'Court; I am a magistrate for this county. I remember a mob assembling at Heytesbury on the morning of the 25th of November. I read the proclamation in the riot act to them, and when I had concluded it, I saw that it was then about twenty-five minutes past seven. At that time, there were only eighty or ninety persons standing in a dense mass. There were other persons assembled loosely about them. I saw in that mob Bartlett, Munday, Beminster, Watley, House, Harford, Hunt, and Farley. I think Bevan was there, but I am not certain. Not only on that morning, but on the previous night, at ten o'clock, I had spoken to these people on the illegality of their proceedings. I spoke to Bartlett, Munday, and Beminster, on the previous evening; also to Hunt



and Harford. I warned them of the illegality of their conduct. It was an hour and a half after I had read the proclamation in the morning, that the mob started from Heytesbury. They went to Knook, to get, as they said, some cider from a farmer of the name of Parham, who had promised them some. From something they said, I doubted their intentions, and followed them. Knook is about one mile and a half from the place of their assembly. I left them at Knook, because they promised that they would keep the peace, and separate after drinking their cider. In consequence of information I afterwards received, I went to Corton. I got there at a quarter before twelve. I found the mob at a turn of the road leading to Corton. They were then consulting which turn they should take. They took the road to Mr. Patient's farm. I saw Bartlett there, taking the lead in the party. He cheered them on and gave the word of command. I am not sure whether he had any thing in his hand at first, but he had afterwards a club, which he held up in a menacing manner. I saw Munday repeating the word of command after Bartlett, and acting with great violence. Beminster was there, and very noisy. At this time there was a great change in the temper of the mob from that which they had exhibited in the morning. I begged them to desist. I told them that I would mark every man. The more I spoke, the more they hooted. I went with them to Patient's and told them that I was there on purpose to mark them. They did not mind me, but formed a crowd round the machine. It was broken in a minute, evidently by persons who

understood the trade; I should think by blacksmiths and carpenters. On breaking it, they said that it was the seventh machine they had broken. I heard something said at that time about cider. I pushed my horse as well as I could through the mob, and told Mr. Patient at his peril not to give them any. He said that he was forced to do so. I then followed the mob to another farm. They broke a machine there, but they broke it so quickly that at the time I did not know that it was broken. I then turned round to go away. The mob then cheered. I turned round and I saw them raise their sticks. I pushed my horse back into them and marked Bartlett as one of the men who so raised a stick. Witness here identified all the prisoners as having been present at this second farm. William Smith was there. I was much shocked at seeing him. He is a labourer of my own. I saw him with a bill-hook. I then left the mob. I heard them say that they would go to Sutton, which is about a mile and a half from the place where they then were. I had sent for the yeomanry cavalry and the special constables to meet me at a certain point. The cavalry and special constables took all the prisoners but two. I took afterwards the other two, whom I had noticed, in their own houses. The river was much swollen, but when the cavalry came, the mob took the river to get out of their way. There was not a man in the mob intoxicated.

Many of the prisoners, in their defence, said, that farmer Parham had told them that if they would come and break his machine on the 25th of November, he would give them half-a-hogshead of cider, and if that was not enough, he would



give them more. They went to farmer Parham's accordingly; they got the cider, the cider got into their heads, and thus it happened that they were placed at the bar. The Jury then returned a verdict of *Guilty* against all the prisoners, but recommended Bevan and Farley to mercy, on account of the excellence of their characters.

3. ASSASSINATION.—Mr. Thomas Ashton, son of one of the principal cotton-spinners and manufacturers at Hyde, in the neighbourhood of Manchester, was shot through the heart when returning in the evening from his father's factory; the following evidence was given before the Coroner:

Hannah Sidebotham; Is servant to Samuel Ashton, esq., of Pole Bank, in the township of Werneth. Deceased left his father's house after tea, about half-past seven on Monday night. He was officiating for his brother James that evening at the Apethorne factory, in consequence of his brother's absence at Mr. Barlow's, at Highfield. He had just before arrived from the factory at Woodley, of which he had the management. In a quarter of an hour after his absence, information was given to the family of the melancholy event. The Apethorne mill is less than half-a-mile from the house of his father. Mr. Thomas seldom attended at that mill. The messenger who brought the intelligence asked for Mr. Thomas Ashton: he was told, that he was gone out. He said he believed Mr. Thomas was down in the lane, and hurt; he then went away, and two of the female servants went with him. In ten minutes after he left the house he was brought in quite dead. —James Andrews; Is book-keeper

in the Apethorne-mill. Knows that three men were discharged about six weeks ago from the mill, in consequence of irregularity in their general conduct; their names were Ralph Stopford, Thomas Platt, and Matthew Both: gave them notice under the order of Mr. James Ashton; but Mr. James allowed the two latter to remain unemployed. Platt was ultimately discharged, and not taken in again. James Stanfield, a youth, was discharged; but that was previously to the others, and he had since applied to be taken on at the Woodley-mill. Does not recollect any threatening language used by the two men discharged towards Mr. James Ashton. —Richard Wainwright; Is manager over the spinners. Platt and Stanfield were discharged because of their being members of the Trades' Union. Platt thought he was paid too little for his work, which led him to join the Union. He said there was going to be a turn-out in Stalybridge, and a great advance would take place. This was in November. Witness endeavoured to prevail upon him to forego his determination of joining the Union as he had then a comfortable situation, and he could not better himself; but Platt was resolute, and he left. He has three or four little children. Mr. James Ashton directed his discharge. —Martha Percival, aged nine years, stated, that, on Monday evening, as she was returning alone, about seven o'clock, from the Apethorne factory to her father's house at Gerrard's-hollow, she met three men near the gate which leads by the private road to Mr. Ashton's residence. She distinctly heard persons walking backward and forward between Swindell's farm-



house and Cheetham's old factory, for a short period before they came up to her, which (according to the distance which had been measured for the purpose) is about 100 yards. [This portion of the lane is that part which the deceased had to pass through on his way to the mill, after leaving the private road through the field, and which is the greatest length without a house in the whole distance to the mill.] When witness met them, she observed one of them carrying, as she called it, a gun, and, on her attempting to pass on the right-hand side of them, one of them prevented her, by stepping further to the right, and thereby forcing her to pass between them; evidently in order to conceal the weapon, which she plainly saw by afterwards turning her head, that he carried in his right hand. She said she thought it was a gun, as she had often seen "Jud Bennet" carry one in the same way. They were all grown-up men. Said, she told her mother of the circumstance, and the alarm it occasioned her.—Several other witnesses were examined, but as there was no evidence directly tending to criminate any one, the Jury returned a verdict, "*Wilful Murder* against three persons at present unknown." The father of Mr. Ashton offered a reward of 500*l.* for the discovery of the offenders; another of 500*l.* was offered by his other relatives; and the Secretary of State offered 1,000*l.* more, with pardon to any accomplice, excepting the hand that actually fired the pistol, who would come forward and give the desired information.

5. AFFRAY WITH SMUGGLERS.—A Coroner's Inquest was held on the bodies of William

Crittenden and George Harold, who had been killed in an affray on the beach, about two miles to the eastward of Hastings.

William Rixon, ex-seaman, belonging to the *Hyperion*, was on duty on the beach about 3 o'clock in the morning of Wednesday last, near Gover's-cottage. A sloop showed a light about two miles from the shore, to the southward and westward. In about ten minutes afterwards a boat left her, which was making for the shore. As soon as she came near, could see three men pulling, and one man in the stern steering. He went up under the cliff, and saw thirty or forty men with sticks nine or ten feet long; they looked like soldiers with muskets. So soon as he hailed them, another party, which he had not seen before, ran to attack the two men who were on duty near him. The first party which he had seen threatened his life, and said, if he did not fire, they would not hurt him; but if he fired, they would cut his throat. He immediately fired his musket for assistance; did not recollect which way he fired; he might have fired in the direction in which the men stood. They sprang on him; about a dozen handled him, struck him on the side of the head with their sticks, which forced him to the ground, and stunned him, after which he was senseless for some time; and as he was recovering, they struck him again. Some of his comrades came to his assistance. After the men had left him, he found he had been dragged a considerable way up the cliff. They had torn his clothes in trying to disarm him. He then went down to the boat, and stood by her, until his officer came down and



seized her. The smugglers took his pistols and musket from him. The duty imposed on him, in case of an attempt to land contraband goods, was, to resist to the utmost of his power. He fired as a signal for assistance. The men were on the cliff rather above him. He fired once before he was knocked down; but afterwards discharged four or five pieces as signals for assistance. The men went down to the boat to take the goods out. He could hear them run down and up the beach while the people were beating him. There were 93 tubs in the boat.—William Bocock, seaman of the *Hyperion*, was on duty on the beach, near Gover's-cottage, about 3 o'clock on the morning of the 5th; a sloop, about two miles to the southward and westward, put up a light, and a boat soon afterwards came from her, making for the shore. He said to William Rixon, "Here's a boat coming in;" which we took to be a galley. She came pretty close to the shore, and lay on her oars. A man, named Devorce, came to relieve me. Rixon slewed round, and went nearer to a party of men in the cliff. We then were twenty or thirty yards asunder. The party sung out, "Don't fire, and we will not hurt you." Another said, "If you do fire, we will cut your throats;" or something to that effect. They then came down off the cliff towards us, with great bats in their hands, as thick as my arm, and Rixon fired his musket. He (Bocock) then fired also, but could not see Rixon for the people who were round him, but fired amongst them. Could not tell who he hit, neither did he see what they did to Rixon. The party followed him, and three or four of them knocked him down at the water's

edge with their bats. His arms and ammunition were taken from him, and thrown into the sea, when the men called out for the boat to come in, which she did. He did not know what happened afterwards, as he was insensible from the blows which he received. He had fired one pistol and his musket. They were loaded with a ball each. He did not fire at all until Rixon was knocked down, and the men with bats were coming down on him. Did not know whether his shot took effect or not. Two officers of the preventive service confirmed several of the above statements.

The Jury brought in their verdict that "William Crittenden and Joseph Harrod died from gun-shot wounds inflicted by some person or persons unknown; but that it was justifiable homicide on the part of those who shot them."

ERRONEOUS VERDICT. — At the Special Commission at Salisbury, Isaac Looker was indicted for sending a threatening letter to John Rowland, in these words:—

"Mr. Rowland, Haxford Farm, —Hif you goes to sware against or a man in prisson, you have here farm burnt down to ground, and thy bluddy head chopt off."

Some evidence was produced to shew that the prisoner, in his conversation, had justified the machine-breakers and fire-raisers, and that the magistrates and military, who disturbed the proceedings of the mobs, were the only breakers of the peace; but the case turned on the question, whether the letter was in the hand-writing of the prisoner. The witnesses were—

Philip Watts; I know the prisoner. I have often seen him write. I have no doubt these papers are his writing. The other two pieces are also his writing.—



Cross-examined ; It is four or five years since I saw him write. I have lived near the prisoner for a long time. We have not been friends for three or four years. We have not spoken to each other for three or four years. We had a dispute about some grounds belonging to the marquis of Ailesbury. Should not be sorry or glad at the result of this trial.—Mr. Woodman ; I know the prisoner. I was acquainted with his hand-writing six or seven years ago, but not since. I believe those letters to be his hand-writing. I received them from Watts. — Cross-examined ; I have not been in the habit of speaking to prisoner for the last five or six years. I don't know the cause : he did not speak to me. I can't say why ; but I had never any quarrel or difference with him. — Edward Vaisey ; I have known the prisoner a long time. I have seen him write. I have not seen him write since 1824. I have had many bills and letters of his, and have some of his writings in my possession now. (The papers already referred to handed to witness.) I know this hand-writing, it is that of the prisoner. I received one of these papers, while a nephew of the prisoner's was in custody, on a charge by me of breaking a thrashing-machine. It was about the 21st of December. — Cross-examined ; I have not spoken much to the prisoner. I never had much of a quarrel with him. I have not spoken to him for a twelvemonth. He cut a road through a meadow of mine about three years ago, which had been stopped up sixteen years before. I don't think we have spoken since.—Mr. Smith ; (A ledger and other books belonging to the prisoner put in.) These

books the prisoner acknowledged before the magistrate to be his, and, for the greater part, in his hand-writing. I was sworn a special constable in November last. I went in that character along with Taunton, the Bow-street officer, to the house of the prisoner, having received a warrant to search his premises, where I found this blank piece of paper, which I have no doubt is part of the same sheet of paper on which the letter is written. It was in his bureau. There was a peculiar irregularity in the edges of each, and the three pieces fitted exactly into each other. At the time I searched the house, I had those three letters in my possession, and, I should say, they formed part of the sheet found in the possession of the prisoner, as the rough edges of one part fit into the other. The blank paper is also a part of the same sheet. The water-mark is divided ; one part of it is on the blank piece, the other on the letter. The prisoner said, the bureau was his, and that he kept his papers there. It was not locked. The bureau was in the kitchen where the family sate.—For the defence were called ; William Tully ; I have known the prisoner twenty-five years. I have often seen him write. I saw him write as lately as March last (the letter to Rowland was here handed to witness). That is not the prisoner's hand-writing, nor like it. I have no doubt it is not his hand-writing.—The other papers handed to witness.—I don't think these papers are his hand-writing. (Prisoner's ledger was here handed to witness.) I believe this to be his hand-writing. The letters now produced are in a better hand than the prisoner's.—George Ed-



wards ; I am vestry-clerk of the parish of Wimbourne. I have known the prisoner eleven years. I have seen him write, and know his hand-writing ; I have seen him write within this year or two. (The letter to Rowland was handed to witness.) From what I have seen of his writing, I don't think that is the prisoner's hand-writing. — Cross-examined ; I have been a schoolmaster. I don't think this is prisoner's hand-writing. His is a systematic round hand, but this is angular and pointed. The character of the writing is very different from his. — Robert Evely. I have had dealings with the prisoner for eleven years. I have seen him write five or six weeks successively, at market. (The letter to Rowland was put in.) This is not his hand-writing, and nothing like it. This is much better than his. (Another paper handed to witness.) This is not prisoner's writing ; it is not so good as his. — Cross-examined ; Prisoner frequents my house when he comes to Marlborough on market-days. I have seen him write a hundred times. The last time I saw him write was about five or six weeks ago. I have not seen any of his writing since he has been in custody. — John Bristow White ; I have seen the prisoner write, and know his writing. (The letter to Rowland handed to him.) This is not the hand-writing of the prisoner. It is a much heavier hand-writing. I think prisoner's writing is better. — John Lewington ; I am a labourer. I live at Axford. I have seen prisoner write very often. This (Rowland's letter) is not the prisoner's writing, Witness was here asked whether he could write, and was told to write the prisoner's name. With some difficulty he

wrote the name "Isaac," but in such a scrawl that Isaac himself could not know it. — Cross-examined ; I am a labourer in the service of the prisoner, and have been so for nine years. I was taken up for some of the riots, but was let go again the next day. I was bound over to keep the peace for twelve months. — Several other witnesses gave similar evidence, and it was proved that the desk or bureau was always open. In summing up, Mr. Justice Alderson called the attention of the jury to the fact of the fitting of the pieces of paper written on with that found in the prisoner's bureau, of which the prisoner had offered no explanation. The Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*. Mr. Justice Alderson proceeded to pass sentence : "The Jury have found you guilty, on evidence which must satisfy every reasonable man, that — Prisoner ; My Lord, I am innocent. I never touched the paper. I never wrote a line of it. My Lord, I am innocent. — Mr Justice Alderson ; You have been found guilty of a crime, which is certainly not mitigated by your denial, after such evidence — a crime which strikes at the very root of society, by tending to obstruct the due administration of justice. — The prisoner here again interrupted his Lordship, and said, My Lord, I declare I am innocent ; I never wrote the paper ; I never put my hand to it. The desk in which the piece of blank paper was found was open to five or six persons in the house, as well as to myself. My Lord, the law may find me guilty, but it cannot make me so. I now declare solemnly, that I am innocent of this crime. — The learned Judge proceeded : I cannot attend to these assevera-



tions, for we all know that a man who can be guilty of such an offence as that of which you have been convicted, will not hesitate to deny it as you now do. I would rather trust to such evidence as has been given in your case, than to the most solemn declaration even on the scaffold; for we know that they are persisted in by men in whose case, from all that has come before the Court, there can be no doubt whatever; and sitting to administer justice, I must not be deterred by your repeated denials, from doing my duty, in passing on you the sentence of the law, which is *Transportation for Life*.

The Jury now obtained permission to leave Court for a time to get some refreshment, and the Judge also retired. During their absence, a young man, apparently about seventeen or eighteen years old, the son of the prisoner, was brought to the table by the solicitor who conducted the defence. He there acknowledged, that it was he wrote the letters, and not his father. A piece of paper was then given to him, and he wrote from memory a copy of the letter sent to Rowland. When compared with the original, there could be no doubt that the handwriting was the same. The copy was not a verbatim transcript of the original, but there was very little difference, and in all the words badly spelt in the original, the same spelling was adhered to in the copy. He then was shown the original and told to copy it, which he did *verbatim*. The hand-writing in both were exactly similar.—On the return of the learned judge to Court, these facts were made known to him, and the copies of the letter were laid before him by Mr. Everett, the

Counsel for Looker. The Court was also informed, that the son had acknowledged that he wrote the letters, and did so in order to save his cousins, who had been accused of breaking machines. His lordship expressed his surprise that these facts had not been brought forward at the trial, or at least before he passed sentence. He could not account for it; and without meaning to impute that it was so, he must say that it looked like a trick. However, he would have all the facts laid before him, and would give them due consideration, for though the application came late, yet it never was too late to do what was right. It was at last determined to try the prisoner on one of the other two indictments against him for sending similar letters, to give him an opportunity of bringing before the jury the new facts. He was accordingly tried, on the 7th, for sending a threatening letter to Mr. Woodman. The evidence on both sides was the same as on the previous trial, except that the prisoner called his son Edward Looker, who was first cautioned by the Judge that he need not answer any question to criminate himself. I am the son of the prisoner. I am about eighteen years old. I lived with my father in December last. [The three letters handed to witness.] I wrote those papers on the 21st of December last. I wrote them standing at the desk or bureau. It is always kept open. My brothers were present when I wrote those letters. George Vivash was also present. My father was not at home then. He left home at six that morning. He went to Draycot, to sell some wood. Draycot is about ten or twelve miles off. My father did not return till ten at



night. I borrowed the sheet I wrote on at my uncle's. It was only one sheet ; I did not use the whole, and I put the remainder in my father's bureau. When my father came home, I did not tell him what I did. I went that night and dropped the three letters near the houses of the persons to whom they were directed. The first (that to Woodman) I dropped near the arch of the bridge, near Woodman's mill. The second (to Vaisey), and the third (to Rowland), I dropped near their houses. This was about nine o'clock on the same night. I told my brother Isaac of it ; but I never told my father a word about it.—Cross-examined by Mr. Serjeant Wilde. I had some cousins in gaol then, Robert Vivash and George Coleman. They had been in gaol about a week. One of them was at Devizes, and the other at Marlborough. The uncle from whom I borrowed the paper is Coleman's father. He lives quite close to my father. I had not seen my cousins. I had not heard who took them up, but I knew they were in trouble about mobbing and breaking machinery belonging to Woodman and Vaisey. My cousins were not talked about at home. I don't know that I did hear my father and uncle talk about this affair. I don't know that I talked to my father about it. I don't recollect that I heard my father talk about it. I might, but I don't recollect it. I never heard him speak of it. I know that he knew my cousins were in prison. I heard my brothers Isaac and Laban speak about it to my father. I heard my father say it was a bad job. It was seven or eight in the evening when I wrote the letters. I heard people talk that it would get my cousins off, if threatening

letters were written, and I did it without a thought of the consequences. I did not know it would be any harm. I did not know the consequences. I don't know any of the persons who spoke about my cousins. I don't know I said much to my father about it. We talked about how they would be punished, and how they would get off. I mean how they would get off in punishment. My father said, they would be transported. I don't know when I spoke to my father about it. I did not talk to my brothers about writing. My brother Laban knew it, for he saw me at the desk and saw what I wrote. I can't say what I said to my father. I don't know whether it was before or after the letters were written that I spoke to my father about how my cousins would get off in punishment. I got the paper from my aunt. There was no paper in my father's house, but what was written upon. My father did not know that I wrote those letters. He did not know it till he was in prison. I did not know what the persons came to the house for until after they came. I did not hear from a person named Martin, that a Bow-street officer had come down about it. I never heard it talked about. It was my uncle who first told my father about the letters. I told my uncle when my father went to prison. I told my father's lawyer of this about a week ago. I did not intend to disguise my hand. I did not give it a thought whether it would be known or not.—Re-examined. The bureau was three or four yards distant from the fire where my brothers were. My back was turned to the table.—By the Court. I dried the letters at the fire : my brother Isaac asked me what it was. My brother Laban



knew it before. I did not tell my aunt what the paper was for. I told my brother Isaac, that I should not tell him what the letter was about. I did not tell him till next day. My uncle knew it before I wrote them. I first conceived the notion of writing the letters from hearing people speak about it in Axford-street. I don't know the names of those persons.—His lordship here directed the witness to write from memory, a copy of what he wrote on that occasion. He did, and it was handed up to his lordship.—Mr. Christopher Day ; I am the solicitor who conducted the defence of the prisoner. Edward Looker communicated to me on Tuesday, the 28th of December last, the fact of his having written the letters. It was stated in Court at the trial, that the sons were in the house at the time the desk was examined. It was not stated that the prisoner had sons living with him capable of writing.—Mr. Justice J. Parke. There can be no doubt that the facts, as they came out on this and on the former trial, made so strong a *prima facie* case against the prisoner, that the public prosecutors would not have been justified if they had not brought the case forward. The case of the Crown has now been answered, and if the Jury believe the evidence of the son, there is no reason whatever to think, that the prisoner had any guilty knowledge of sending the letter.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*.—The learned Judge, with reference to the conviction which took place on the former trial, said, that no time should be lost in making the proper representation to the Secretary of State for the Home Department, who would, of course, take care that justice should be done.

An indictment was immediately prepared and found against the son, to which he pleaded guilty, and was sentenced to transportation for seven years.

7. BURGLARY COMMITTED IN 1825.—At the Glasgow winter Circuit, David Little was charged with having on the 19th of September 1825, broken into the house of Gartloch, parish of Cadder, then occupied by Mrs. Margaret Kippen, or Hill, and stole 8*l.* in notes, silver tea-spoons, a gold-mounted and a silver-mounted eyeglass, a silver-watch, and several other articles. The prisoner pleaded *Not Guilty*.—Mrs. Tait examined ;—In 1825, she resided at Gartloch with her mother, Mrs. Hill, and was at that time unmarried. In September of that year the house was broken into. On the night the house was broken into, she was sleeping in an upper bed-room, which communicated with the room in which her mother slept. She heard a noise, as if some one was up, or a-stir in the house ; witness got up and opened the door, and then returned again to bed, because the noise had subsided. The dining-room was on the ground-floor, immediately beneath her bed-room. The noise was not such as created alarm. The next noise she heard was a scream from her sister ; witness again got up, and thought she saw a light gleaming beneath the door ; witness went into the dressing-room, and, on looking into the passage, she saw several men with a light, and witness returned immediately to her room and locked the door. The next thing she heard was the bell of her sister's room ringing violently, then the voice of one of the men saying—“You need not ring—your servants



are bound." The men came into the dressing-room, and said to the witness and her sister that they need not be afraid. It appeared to be the same voice that spoke. It was money they wanted, and they wished witness to come out and give it, or tell them where the money was to be found; witness told them; they got the keys, and the drawer containing the money. Does not recollect if they asked for the keys, and does not think they used threatening language; but they said immediately afterwards that they would break the door, and named some of the instruments they intended to use. Witness was under great alarm, and it was under that influence she told them about the keys. Witness refused to leave the room, as she was undressed, and the same man's voice said there was no time to be scrupulous. Witness told them the keys were in her own pocket in the dressing-room. The chest of drawers stood in the dressing-room, to which she directed them as the place where the money was. They committed a mistake in going to the wrong drawer, and informed witness of the circumstance, when witness directed them to the proper drawer. There was between 10*l.* and 11*l.* in the drawer. After they got the money, they said something as if they did not believe it was all that was in the house; one of them said, don't touch any bills or letters. During some part of that time, witness went to the window, and called upon the grieve and the gardener. Witness's intention in calling was with the view of frightening the party in the dressing-room. It was at that time the men threatened to break the door and use a pistol. Before the men left the

room, witness heard them tell each other to lift up their daggers and pistols. Soon after leaving the room, they said if she went down stairs or called for assistance within an hour, they would return; and then made use of threatening language about a pistol. Witness left the room almost immediately, and went into her sister's room, and afterwards proceeded to her mother's apartment. At the open window she heard the cries of murder from the lawn. She went down stairs shortly afterwards to see what state the servants were in. She entered the dining-room, and saw the window open, and proceeded to the maid-servant's apartment, in which she thinks she observed the maids but does not recollect the state they were in; they were not in bed; their names were Catherine Ferguson and Christian Lawson. One of them went with witness to the door of the man-servant's apartment; a noise was made at the door, but no answer was made. They afterwards returned to the dining room, and observed one of the large panes of the window and the shutter broken; there was tar on the broken pane. A glove was found in the house, but she had no particular recollection of its description. Witness missed between 10*l.* and 11*l.*, a silver-mounted opera-glass, and other articles, which had been in the dressing-room on the previous evening, and to the best of her recollection, the opera-glass produced was the one stolen. — Christian Lawson, or M'Lean, was servant at Gartloch when the house was broken into on the 20th of September, 1825. The first thing she recollected was the door being opened and shut, locked and unlocked; she then heard feet in the lower lobby,



near where she slept, and from which her room door opened. A small passage was off the lobby to the room. A person came into her room holding a candle in one hand and something like a soldier's bayonet in the other. Another came in with a woman's cloak round his shoulders, and both had night-caps over their faces, with holes near the eyes. A third entered, who had on a coarse great coat, of a black colour, something like the one produced. He had on an old black hat drawn down on his face. Witness got up on her elbow in bed, and asked what they wanted. Catherine Ferguson was in the same bed with witness. The first man, said, "hold your peace—not a word, or I'll run you through, or I'll take your lives.—" Witness could not say which. She then lay down and covered herself with the bed clothes. The man with the candle stood at the head of the bed, the one with the woman's cloak stood between the two chairs, and the third was at the foot of the bed. They took her hands from under the clothes, and put them together across, and tied them with a piece of small twine. The other girl was tied in a similar manner. They said they were men come into the house for the purpose of getting a little money. They soon left the room, and shut the door after them. Shortly after they had left them, Miss Hill came to their room. About a minute after the men left the room, the bed-room bells were rung. When Miss Hill came into the lobby, their hands were still tied. Ferguson untied witness's hands. Miss Hill had called repeatedly on James Wilson, the footman. Before she entered the servant's apartment, witness proceeded to Mrs. Hill's

bed-room. In the dressing-room she saw a glove and a quantity of *spunks*. Mrs. Hill was in bed, and considerably alarmed. It happened between two and three o'clock in the morning. The drawers in the dressing-room were shut. Witness entered the dining-room, and saw the window open, and some of the panes broken. Recollects one of the men turned round and named the witness, and thinks it was he who carried the candle. The panel resembles the man with the great coat, and the hat over his face. He was nearly of the prisoner's size. The other two men were taller than the man with the great coat. She did not see hats on the other two men. Both of the men spoke.—Catherine Ferguson, or Campbell, another servant, who was sleeping in the same apartment with the preceding witness, corroborated the greater part of Christian Lawson's statement.—James Wilson was a servant at Gartloch, on 20th September, 1825, when the house was robbed. His room was next the kitchen. The first thing he heard was one saying to another, "Bind him, bind him; tie him, tie him." The men said something else, but he did not understand it. He thinks they did not observe that he was awake. They were in the attitude of leaving the room and shutting the door, when he got up and observed the shadows from the candle. They then shut the door, and locked it. Witness rose and opened the door, and, after remaining for some time in the room, went out by the back window with part of his dress on. After he got out, he proceeded towards the offices, and, while he was on his way, he saw a person following him, and witness ran, and arrived at the offices, calling out,



“Robbers, robbers.” Witness continued running for nearly a mile, and returned to the house in about twenty minutes thereafter with two men. The men were away, and witness missed his watch from the room. He did not observe the figures of the robbers.—James Robertson, jun. : heard cries of “robbers” on that night; witness took the handle of a rake; two men started from the shrubbery, before the dining-room window, and ran off. He ran after, and overtook one of them, whom he knocked down with the stick in his hand. He struck him on the side of the head. His father then came forward, and the man told his father that two men had attacked him on the Stirling road with pistols, and had ordered him to follow them. He got on his feet again, but his father knocked him down with a poker; they left him lying and returned to the house. He cried out that he was done. The man had on a large coat, like a watchman’s, of a white colour. That is like the coat. Did not see his countenance, it being dark, but he appeared to be five feet eight or nine, the same height as the prisoner. They afterwards went back to where the man had been left, but he was gone.—Mary M’Kie, or Laing; lived five years ago at John Little’s house in Drygate, Glasgow. Recollects Mrs. Hill’s house being robbed at that time. Little had some sons, of whom David, the prisoner, was one. Thinks the prisoner and Mathias his brother were in the house on the Monday night before the robbery, at ten o’clock. Saw David next morning with his head tied up in a napkin: he was cut somewhere about the nose: but he had a cut above which she did not

see. His head was not tied up the night before.—Charles Kerr was then called. He lodged in John Little’s house at the time of the Gartloch robbery. He believed Mathias and David Little were not in the house on the night of the robbery. He saw David next night in his father’s house, with some cuts on the fore part of his head, and sticking-plaister on them, which he took off, and closed them up a second time. He had been taken, he said, to a house somewhere out of town, and that something had been taken out of it. He said he had got the blows at that house, and acknowledged being in the house, and witness understood that he had got the blow about the door. The man who gave him the blow, as he understood, had run away from him after the others, and left him stupid and senseless. Prisoner shewed him a seal he had got in the house; he was shown 5*l.* in notes, and 3*l.* in silver, but cannot recollect whether it was by prisoner or not. Understood that Mathias and David Little had been together.—Thomas Williamson, police officer in Manchester: apprehended the prisoner, on 31st July, in a factory in Miller’s-lane, Manchester. Prisoner asked why? Witness said he could not tell, but he said it was for something done in Glasgow, or the neighbourhood. About two hours after, while on the way to the New Bailey, prisoner said, it was needless to deny it; and asked what they could do to him. The old woman, he said, would know him, as he had saved her life. He said they did not take above 7*l.*, but gave no particulars about the robbery. The Jury found the prisoner *Guilty*, but, in consideration of his youth at the time the offence



was committed, and it appearing that this was the only public offence of which he had been guilty, unanimously recommended him to mercy. He was executed on the 27th of January.

10. SEDITION.—OLD BAILEY.—*The King v. Carlile*—Richard Carlile was indicted for having written and published two seditious libels—one tending to bring the Crown into disrepute, and the other, which was addressed to the insurgent agricultural labourers, tending to produce insurrection among the labouring and agricultural population. The libel was as follows:—“To the Insurgent Agricultural Labourers—You are much to be admired for every thing you are known to have done during the last month; for, as yet, there is no evidence before the public that you are incendiaries, or even political rebels. Much as every thoughtful man must lament the waste of property—much as the country must suffer by the burnings of farm produce now going on—were you proved to be the incendiaries, we should defend you by saying, that you have more just and moral cause for it than any king or faction, that ever made war, had for making war. In war, all destructions of property are counted lawful, upon the ground of that which is called the law of nations. Yours is a state of warfare, and your ground of quarrel is the want of the necessities of life in the midst of an abundance. You see hoards of food, and you are starving. You see a government rioting in every sort of luxury and wasteful expenditure, and you, ever ready to labour, cannot find one of the comforts of life. Neither your silence nor your patience has obtained for you the least respectful

attention from that government. The more tame you have grown, the more you have been oppressed and despised, the more you have been trampled on; and it is only now, that you begin to display your physical as well as your moral strength, that your cruel tyrants treat with you, and offer terms of pacification. Your demands have been, so far, moderate and just, and any attempt to stifle them, by the threatened severity of the new administration, will be so wicked as to justify your resistance even to death, and to life for life.”

The publication being proved, the defendant, who was his own counsel, contended, in a speech of five hours and a half, that the character of the writing charged as libellous was not calculated to produce any pernicious effects. He denied that he had ever countenanced the destruction of property by fire, or the breaking of machinery; but, although he did not wish to see machinery destroyed, he would not have the working population starve. He then went on to defend his own libels, by endeavouring to prove that other publications were equally libellous; and contended, at considerable length, that he had merely exercised the right of a freeman, in delivering a free opinion upon political questions. He called on the Jury not to attend to the comments of the Judge, who would sum up the case, nor to the Counsel who would be heard in reply; but to judge themselves both of the law and fact, and return a verdict of acquittal.—The Jury having retired at nine o'clock in the evening, returned into court at eleven, with a verdict, “Guilty of publishing,” but that one or two of them could not agree whether the publication was libellous. The Recorder told them



they must agree upon that before he could receive their verdict.—A Juror. Are we to decide, my lord, as to whether the publication be libellous or not? This is the point upon which we disagree.—Recorder. I have explained to you, pretty plainly, the law upon the subject, and you must give a verdict upon the whole case.—The Jury again retired.—At twelve o'clock the Recorder again entered the Court, and directed an officer to go for the Jury, who, in a few minutes, returned to the box, and their names being again called over,—The Clerk of the Arraignment said, Gentlemen, are you now agreed?—Foreman. No.—Recorder. I again ask you, gentlemen, if there is any point on which the Court can assist you?—A Juror. My lord, our objections remain the same. I cannot, conscientiously with my oath, agree to find the defendant guilty; and I am now ready to state my reasons.—Recorder. I cannot ask for a jurymen's reasons, because I am bound to believe that they are conscientious and good. You must retire again.—They accordingly did so, and at one o'clock returned into Court again, but declared that they could not agree. Again they retired, and, after again consulting together, returned a verdict, acquitting the defendant on the first count in the indictment, but finding him guilty on the second and third counts, which charged the defendant with addressing inflammatory language to the labouring classes. The sentence was, that "he should pay a fine to the king of 200*l.*, be imprisoned in the Compter of the city for the space of two years, and, at the expiration of that time, should find sureties for ten years to come, himself in 500*l.*, and two sureties

in 250*l.* each, and should be imprisoned until such fine were paid, and such sureties provided."

10. BURNING OF GREENWICH THEATRE.—About twelve o'clock at night, the little theatre in London-street, Greenwich, was discovered to be on fire. On the arrival of the engines every exertion was used to preserve the theatre from total destruction. The interior was, however, completely gutted, and the whole of the scenery, machinery, dresses, and decorations, were destroyed. The fire communicated to the premises of Mr. Wheatley, the Greenwich-coach and omnibusproprietor, which were much injured. The horses and carriages were removed in safety. Mrs. Wheatley, who was labouring under illness, was taken out of her house by one of her sons in an insensible state. How the fire originated was not known.

21. SALVAGE. — ADMIRALTY COURT.—This was an action, the circumstances of which were rather important, inasmuch as they involved a serious charge against the Blakeney pilots. The City of Edinburgh steam-vessel, of 450 tons, with fifty passengers and a cargo, from Leith to London, in the beginning of January last, met with foul weather off Flamborough Head, and, after reaching the Humber, on the 12th she took shelter under a shoal at the mouth of the river: the gale increasing, she was driven from her anchor, and proceeded towards Blakeney, on the coast of Norfolk, but was unable to cross the bar, and, on the 13th, anchored about three miles from the coast, in nine fathoms water. Here the circumstances took place, which formed the subject of the action. On the part of the salvors (boatmen of Blakeney, twenty-five



in number), it was charged, that the steam-vessel, when first seen, was in great distress, driving towards a lee-shore, the wind E.N.E.; that she made signals of distress, and the salvors, after endeavouring in vain to get out the life-boat, kept watch all night on the deck; that the steamer manifested an intention of running on shore, which would have been sure destruction, but the salvors, waving a jacket, warned her off; that the weather continued extremely boisterous after the vessel had got off Blakeney-bar, the salvors endeavouring still to get to her assistance, and the steamer still showing signals of distress, night and day; that, on the 15th, they succeeded in getting to her, and found that a boat from Wells had reached her; that the mate of the City of Edinburgh had admitted, that her engine was ruined, that she was "strained to pieces," and that "her seams were so open, that you might see the green sea through the engine-room;" that the master told the salvors that the vessel and cargo were worth 33,000*l.*, and that they should be well rewarded for their assistance; that they exerted themselves, at the risk of their lives, and got her into Blakeney harbour that day, and continued on board till the 17th, when the storm had abated; that the master (Fraser) refused then to make any remuneration beyond the sum of 10*l.* for pilotage, which had since been increased to a tender of 15*l.* On the part of the owners of the ship and cargo, a very different case was set up. They alleged, in the first place, that, when the vessel was approaching Blakeney, the wind was not E.N.E., but E. by S., which did not blow direct upon the land; and, further, that, upon near-

ing Blakeney, the flag was hoisted on the church to denote that there was sufficient water, but, being unable to see the buoy, owing to a sudden fall of snow, the master was obliged to haul off, and remained all the ensuing day (the 13th) within three miles of the shore; that no signal of distress had ever been shown, the only colour shown was the union jack at the fore-top-mast-head, the usual signal for a pilot, which, in the evening (as was customary), was exchanged for a light; that, on that and the following day, no pilot came out (though a boat might have come with perfect safety), notwithstanding an additional (customary) signal shown in the mizen rigging; that at daylight on the 15th, the vessel having rode out the gale during the night, a boat from Wells came to the vessel and tendered aid; that the master was warned of the extortionate character of the Blakeney men; that the only engagement made, when the Blakeney boat came up (which claimed the right of piloting), was for piloting the steamer into Blakeney harbour; that, when in the harbour, the master was informed that, during the gale, some sailors had volunteered to man the life-boat, and go to the assistance of the vessel, but the Blakeney men had taken it from the sailors, saying, that it would not pay them for their trouble, but if the storm increased, the vessel would go on shore, and then they should get well paid; that the master never stated, that the value of the ship and cargo was 33,000*l.*, or any amount; that it was in fact only 13,000*l.*, and he denied that he had promised any remuneration beyond the pilotage. The salvors had demanded 1,000*l.*, and took bail for the action in



1,500*l.*—Sir C. Robinson, after some observations upon the case, proposed to the two Trinity Masters, by whom he was assisted, the following questions:—1st, Whether, regard being had to the state of the wind and weather on the 13th and 14th of January, it was in the power of the salvors to go off to the vessel as pilots, and bring her into the harbour?—2nd, Whether their services, on the 15th, were so enhanced by the danger, as to establish a claim to a reward, in addition to their pilotage, on that account?—The two gentlemen declared their opinion to be, that, allowing there was difficulty and danger in getting off on the 13th and 14th, there had been a want of exertion on the part of the salvors, and that they had made no fair trial, which it was their duty to make as pilots, and that there was no danger whatever on the 15th; all the service rendered that day being simple pilotage, the weather being moderate, and the wind fair for the harbour.—Sir C. Robinson declared that such was his opinion, and he therefore pronounced against the claim for remuneration. With regard to the charge against the salvors of refusing to go out, in expectation of reaping an advantage from the expected augmented peril of the vessel, he observed that the charge ought to have been more specific, and brought in a different form. As to the costs, he was not, under all the circumstances, disposed to give them against the salvors. He could not by any means extenuate their conduct; it was wrong, it was foolish, but it was a way in which persons in their situation were too apt to act, and he could not put that interpretation upon it to say that it was malicious. On the other hand, the

master's conduct had been negligent, to say the least, in not bringing forward the charge in a more specific shape, and not making any complaint upon the subject in his protest. By giving costs against the salvors, he should throw upon these poor people a burden greater than their pilotage. He should pronounce for the tender, and decree all the salvors' expenses.

24. FIRE.—Between eleven and twelve o'clock at night, the church of St. Peter, Birmingham, was discovered to be on fire. The fire-engines made little impression on the flames, which were not checked, after the whole of the interior, including the magnificent organ, had been destroyed, by the falling in of the roof, leaving nothing standing but the outside walls. St. Peter's was a very beautiful costly church. It had been built only three years before.

27. INQUEST.—An inquest was held on the body of the right hon. Lord Rivers, which had been found in the Serpentine River, Hyde Park, two days before. Mr. John Ambrose, his lordship's steward, stated, that on Friday last he received a letter from his lordship requesting him to come to his lordship's town residence, No. 10, Grosvenor-place, on the following Tuesday, for the purpose of paying over the rents. He arrived there, about three o'clock in the afternoon for that purpose, and found the family in the highest state of alarm and excitation. On inquiring the cause, he learned that Lord Rivers had been absent since Sunday evening, and that, notwithstanding every search and inquiry had been instituted, no tidings could be learnt of his lordship. On being informed that persons were then dragging the Serpentine River, in



expectation of finding the body, he repaired thither. He found the men dragging at the east end, near the waterfall, and in about five minutes the body of his lordship was raised to the surface and drawn out. The body was about two or three yards from the footpath. It was immediately conveyed to the house in which they were assembled; there were no signs of life, and the body appeared to have been immersed two or three days. The deceased lived upon good terms with his lady and family, and always appeared most happy in their society. Witness knew of no occurrence which could possibly have deranged his lordship's mind so as to have caused him to commit suicide. On the contrary, his lordship's affairs were in the most prosperous state, and he lived upon the most affectionate terms with Lady Rivers. He was very near-sighted, so as not to be able to discern an object at any distance without the help of his glass, which he always carried with him, and when shooting he always wore spectacles. It was extremely probable, that, from this defect in his vision, his lordship had fallen off the footpath into the river by accident.

James Basten, Superintendent of the Humane Society's Receiving-house, deposed to finding the body in the presence of the last witness; and produced a gold repeating watch, with the appendages, and 1*l.* 3*s.* 6*d.* in money, which he took out of his lordship's pockets. The witness added, that this part of the river was so extremely dangerous, that no less than ten persons fell in from the causeway one foggy night, a short time ago, and were with difficulty saved.

John Baker, a footman to Lady Rivers, said, that his lordship dined with Lady Rivers and his family, consisting of two daughters and a son, on Sunday afternoon last. He appeared much as usual, and witness observed nothing about him indicative of aberration of mind. He left his residence on foot about 9 o'clock on the same evening, which was customary with him.

The Jury, after a short consultation, returned the following verdict:—"Found *drowned* near the public path at the head of the Serpentine River, considered very dangerous for want of a rail or fence, where many persons have lately fallen in."

## FEBRUARY.

1. RAILWAY ACCIDENTS.—On the Liverpool and Manchester railway, the engines are employed during the night, as well as throughout the day, in conveying goods to and from Liverpool. An engine arrived at three o'clock on Tuesday morning with a train of waggons loaded with merchandise, and after conducting the train to the dépôt at the termination of the line, the engine was returning to the engine-house, which is about a quarter of a mile from Manchester. While doing so, one of the guards, who had accompanied the train from Liverpool, leaped carelessly upon the step of the tender (which carries a supply of water for the engine), where he stood for a few seconds, but his foot slipping he fell upon the ground across one of the rails, and five of the wheels of the engine and tender passed over his body, at the pit of the stomach. The engine was imme-



diately stopped, but the young man had already expired, his body being nearly severed in two. Another fatal accident took place on the Bolton and Leigh railway on Sunday, the 30th of January last. Some children were playing upon the railroad, when one of the carriages, which they were pushing forward in sport, passed over one of their number, a little boy about six years of age, and crushed him so dreadfully, that he expired the same night.

**SNOW-STORM.**—On the night between the 31st of January, and 1st of February, came on a violent snow-storm, which continued for four days; extending over the north of England, and the whole of Scotland, and interrupting the usual mode of communication. The mails from England to Scotland, and from the South to the North of Scotland, were two days behind their time, and were carried through by the guards, with great difficulty and danger, on horse-back or on foot; it being impossible for coaches to proceed. The mail from London to Edinburgh, made its way as far as a mile and a half north of Moffat; when the coach stuck fast in a wreath of snow, from which six horses could not move it. The passengers returned to Moffat; the guard and driver mounted two of the horses, and proceeded through the storm, which was hourly increasing, with the mail bags. It was soon found impossible to proceed even on horse-back. They dismounted, and the guard determined to carry his mails through the storm on foot. The driver regarded the attempt as hopeless, and the road inspector, and some of the roadmen who were near, repeatedly urged him to desist. But his resolution was

fixed, and when his companion appeared to waver, he slung the bags over his own shoulders, and told him he might return to Moffat if he chose. In these circumstances the driver said, he neither could nor would leave him, and both proceeded bearing the mails, which unfortunately, what with double arrivals and newspapers, weighed very nearly seven stone; which, considering the state of the roads, the wind, the drift, the bogs, and mosses, before and around, was a load for horses rather than men. Early next morning, the inspector, having gone out to examine the state of the road, found the bags hanging on a snow post—the farthest of the range—five miles and three quarters beyond Moffat, and within one mile and a quarter of Tweedshaws. The road-surveyor instantly collected a party of men, who, by means of lanterns, poles, and the assistance they rendered one another, succeeded in forcing their way to Tweedshaws; and there learnt, that neither guard nor driver had been seen or heard of. The anxiety of the people of Moffat was now extreme, and a party of nearly one hundred and fifty persons immediately left the village to search for the unfortunate men. Some were armed with poles, and others with spades; but though they continued the search till fairly spent, all they discovered was the driver's hat, which was found in a moss adjoining the snow post. On the following day, a second unsuccessful search was made, and so persevering were the people, that they again went out on Saturday, accompanied by a number of shepherds' dogs. Still they discovered nothing, and had begun to despair of success, when some of them returning by what they con-



sidered a nearer cut, between the new and old lines of road, across a place called Glencrosh-moor, observed, about half a mile beyond the snow post, the points of a man's shoes sticking through the snow. On removing the snow, they found the driver stretched on his back, a stiffened corpse. About a hundred yards farther, they came upon the remains of the guard, half erect, and in the attitude of sleep. His lips and chin were free from snow, which appeared to have been thawed by his breath; and from this it was inferred, that he had been alive for some time after he sunk, faint and exhausted.

4. SHIPWRECK.—During the continuance of the snow storm in the first days of the month, severe losses were sustained at sea. The Czar, one of the smacks sailing between London and Leith, was totally lost near North Berwick. She had sailed from the Nore on the 1st, where there was no appearance of an approaching storm. On the afternoon of the 3rd a fresh breeze from the ESE. sprung up. At midnight they shortened sail, and at four o'clock of the following morning the storm sails were set—the smack being then off Whitby. About noon they passed Holy Island, it then blowing very hard, with snow, and the sea running tremendously high. At four they bore up for the Frith; the wind about this time came suddenly round to ENE. The vessel was then steering about north by west; the land was supposed to be occasionally visible, but very indistinct, as the sleet and frozen snow which fell thickly, and the wind blowing a hurricane, prevented any object at a distance of more than twice the length of the vessel being seen accurately. The sailors, however,

were aware, from the change in the colour of the water, that they were close in shore; but from the violence of the wind and sea, there was not the least hope of getting off—and in an instant they found themselves amongst breakers. The vessel struck, but so great was the force of the wind and sea, that she drove over the rocks for a considerable way. At last she ran alongside a ledge, swung round with her head towards the swell, sat down and bilged, falling over with her deck towards the sea, which now broke with dreadful violence on her starboard bow, and swept every thing from the deck. The passengers, who had gone below to take shelter from the storm, became clamorous, and the captain, Smith, who till this moment had been on deck, went to the cabin to endeavour to allay their fears, with the assurance that the ship being a-ground all was safe, and that, though the vessel was beating with much violence on the rocks, as she was strongly timbered, there was little doubt of her holding together till the tide receded. The tide, however, continued to flow till about seven o'clock; and the vessel beat on the rocks for some hours later. The mast was forced through her bottom. The mate and those on deck sought shelter in the larboard bow. The captain and passengers were collected about the cabin door, the water being up to their knees. About midnight the storm somewhat abated; and the mate again crept aft, and called to those who he believed were below; but receiving no answer, he went down, and finding no person, came to the conclusion that they had reached the shore unobserved. The idea of their being drowned never oc-



curred to those on deck, for although the cries had ceased, their not being heard was attributed to the noise of the storm. The stern boat was also washed away, and the one on deck broken to pieces by the force of the sea. Supposing that those in the cabin had escaped to the shore, those on the forecastle began to think of attempting to get to land also, where they now could see lights, a great fire having been kindled on the beach by Mr. Weir's servants. A young lad leapt into the water, got on shore, and was followed by the others, who were all treated in the most kindly manner by Mr. Weir's family; and not hearing of their companions, the thought of their being drowned, for the first time occurred to them. As far as could be learned there was every reason to suppose, that the persons, who were in the cabin, had been suddenly drowned or killed; a hatchway in the cabin floor was found forced up, the baulk-heads stove in, and the whole cabin furniture broken to pieces. The bodies were found, some in the cabin and some in the hold, and several were mangled, in consequence of being washed about by the violence of the sea. The passengers, ten in number, and five of the crew, including the captain, were all drowned.

5. WARRANTY OF A HORSE.—KING'S BENCH.—*Paul v. Hardwick*.—This was an action on the warranty of a horse, sold by the defendant to the plaintiff, Mr. Paul, the banker, in July last. The warranty was contained in the receipt given by the defendant for the price of the horse, and was in these terms:—"Received of J. B. Paul, esq., the sum of sixty-five pounds, for a bay gelding, warranted sound, and free from vice."

The alleged unsoundness or vice was, that the horse was a crib-biter.—Sir J. Scarlett, in opening the case for the plaintiff, read an extract from Dr. Rees's Cyclopædia, in which crib-biting was described as "one of the worst vices."—It was proved that the horse was a crib-biter; that the defendant had had notice to take him back, but refused, stating that crib-biting was "no vice;" and that he admitted that he knew the horse was a crib-biter at the time when he sold it to the plaintiff.—Mr. Sewell, professor of the veterinary art, stated that crib-biting, which was a vicious habit in horses, was considered as an unsoundness. It was treated as a disease. It frequently led to indigestion, and was curable in its early stages.—Mr. Clark, the author of several treatises on horses, was of opinion that crib-biting was one of the worst vices of a horse.

For the defendant, the Attorney-general called, among other witnesses, Professor Coleman, who stated, that horses had the habit of crib-biting in very different degrees. He was inclined to think that the true meaning of the word "vice" was some vicious quality, which was dangerous to the owner of the horse, or to others who rode or drove it, and not merely a defect or fault, because, if that were the case, tripping or shying would be a vice, and few horses were free from some defect or fault. A crib-biter might be a vicious horse, but was not necessarily so because he was a crib-biter.—Is crib-biting an unsoundness?—That depends on the definition of the word "unsoundness." I have always considered; that, wherever there is an alteration of function in any part, so as to influence the entire functions, and prevent the animal from perform-



ing the common duties of a horse, he is unsound. According to that definition, a crib-biter may or may not be unsound. If the habit exists in a slight degree, that is, if the horse only occasionally bites his crib, but supports his condition, and can perform all the duties of a horse, then I should say he was not unsound.—On his cross-examination, the witness stated that the habit of crib-biting frequently produced a disordered function, which was the effect of swallowing the air in the attempt to lay hold of some fixed object. Thence arose indigestion, and a disordered stomach, with a difficulty of breathing, spasms and inflammation; and if the disorder got lower down, it produced a disorder of the bowels. The habit of crib-biting might be acquired from imitating other horses, but that was by no means the most frequent cause. It frequently attached to high-bred horses, and others that were kept long without food. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred that was the main cause of crib-biting. As the horse in question had been stated to be in good condition, witness should infer that none of its functions were impaired, and that its health was not affected by this habit: and his opinion was, that, in general, crib-biting did not affect the health of the animal.—Lord Tenterden. Suppose a crib-biter, sold to-day in good condition, is found, six months hence, to have inflammation in the stomach or bowels, with a difficulty of breathing, or any of the other symptoms you have described, should you say it was unsound, or not?—Witness. Unsound when sold, inasmuch as you would be able to trace the effect from the cause.—Mr. James Turner, a vete-

rinary surgeon, stated that crib-biting in his opinion was, in the greater number of instances, a habit contracted by imitation. Whether it was or was not injurious to the health of the animal, depended upon the degree in which it attached. Witness believed, that a horse might be a crib-biter, and yet be perfectly sound; but he believed, also, that it was a decided unsoundness in many cases. It showed itself more particularly by the animal distending its body with wind; but all crib-biters did not distend their bodies with wind in the same degree. It could not be considered as a vice, inasmuch as crib-biters were generally perfectly tractable to ride or drive, and they did no danger to their owners.—George Gosden stated, that he had been a veterinary surgeon for sixteen or seventeen years. Had known the habit of crib-biting to exist in various degrees. It was not necessarily either a vice or an unsoundness.—Have you known horses to have that habit in a considerable degree, and yet to be extremely healthy for a number of years, and to be capable of doing their work? I have. I have known the best of horses to be crib-biters.—Do you know that the horse called the Colonel had the habit of crib-biting? I have heard he had it for a number of years.—John Lythe, a veterinary surgeon. Have you known horses to have the habit of crib-biting, and yet their general health not affected by it? Many, in the army particularly.—If they have it not in a degree to affect the health of the animal, are they, in your judgment, unsound because they are crib-biters? Certainly not.—When they have it only in a slight degree, is it a vice? No;



unless it disposes the horse to some bodily mischief.—The witness, on cross-examination, stated, that the habit arose frequently from want of food, and frequently from irritation; and he mentioned an instance of the latter.—Is it a desirable thing for a horse to have?—It is not desirable, certainly, but I never cast a horse for it.—Verdict for the plaintiff.

9. LIBEL.—KING'S BENCH.—*Walker v. Lushington*, M. P., and others. Sir James Scarlett stated, that this was an action brought to recover damages for a libel contained in a speech delivered in Parliament by Dr. Lushington, and afterwards published, among the other debates, in the "Mirror of Parliament," on the ground that Dr. Lushington had authorized the publication of it in that work, of which the other defendants were proprietors and publishers. A certain Mr. Evans had died leaving two wills, one of which had been proved, but Mr. Peddle having found another, which he was advised was the genuine will, the object was, to get the probate of the first will rescinded, and to obtain probate to the second. The plaintiff, an attorney in Bristol, being thus employed by Peddle, had employed Mr. Toller as his proctor in the suit, which proceeded to a certain length, and then Sir John Nicholl pronounced a judgment against Peddle, but without costs. Mr. Peddle being advised by Mr. Toller, the proctor, that the judgment would be set aside on an appeal to the Court of Delegates, determined to carry the case up to that Court, Mr. Toller undertaking that the utmost expense of that proceeding would not exceed 200*l*. The appeal was accordingly prosecuted before the Delegates, but

that Court confirmed the decision of Sir John Nicholl. The consequence of these proceedings was, that a considerable amount of costs became due, the expenses of the original suit being about 1,000*l*. and the costs of the appeal 384*l*. Both Mr. Walker and Mr. Peddle became exceedingly alarmed at this amount of costs, as the property in dispute did not exceed 1,800*l*., and of course it would have been better for all parties, if the proceeding had been let alone altogether. Mr. Peddle, finding that so large an amount of costs had been incurred, was induced to desire to have the bill taxed, and wished to have the assistance of Mr. Walker, his solicitor, in attending before the officer of the Court on the taxation. It appeared, however, that, according to a rule of the Ecclesiastical Court, no one but the proctor in the cause was allowed to be present at the taxation of a bill by the Registrar; and accordingly Mr. Walker was told that he could not be permitted to attend. In consequence of this, a petition was presented to the learned Judge of the Court, and a motion made for Mr. Walker to be at liberty to attend the taxation. The application was refused, and then Mr. Peddle presented a petition to the House of Commons, stating what had occurred, and praying that some redress might be afforded him. Upon that petition a debate took place, in the month of July 1828; and at the close of the Session of that year, which occurred soon afterwards, the publication in question came out, containing the Speech which was said to have been delivered by Dr. Lushington, and published with his corrections. The speech, after a general vindication of Sir John Nicholl, and a



statement that he had acted only according to the rules of the Court, went on in these terms :—“ I will only add, that this is not the petition of the persons whose name is affixed to it, but it is that of a pettifogging attorney, who has been guilty of perjury, and attempted extortion.” That was severe enough to say of any man in the House of Commons, and there could be no necessity for publishing so atrocious a charge. In the same number of this publication was contained another speech of the learned doctor, on the same subject. The part complained of ran thus :—“ In speaking of the solicitor, Mr. Walker, I have, I acknowledge, used very strong expressions, not one word of which will I now retract, for I should be ashamed to avail myself of any Parliamentary privilege to state any matter which I could not afterwards fully substantiate.” The learned counsel said, that Mr. Walker having seen this attack upon his character, in what he supposed to be an authentic record of the speeches in Parliament, became of course exceedingly uneasy, and applied to Dr. Lushington for an explanation, but the learned doctor was inexorable, and as he (the plaintiff) could get no satisfaction out of Court, he had been compelled to bring the present action. In the pleadings, the defendants had rendered the matter still more serious by stating a justification. They first denied, by the general issue, that they had published the speech; and next, they said, “ You (the plaintiff) have been guilty of perjury;” and Dr. Lushington had, in his plea, set forth a statement of the particular perjury alluded to. The doctor’s plea stated, that Mr. Walker had been examined by the

examiner of the Ecclesiastical Court in the suit there pending, and that in answer to one of the questions put to him, he denied that he had any interest in the suit. There was no justification on the part of Dr. Lushington to the expression “ pettifogging attorney;” but the defendant Barrow had gone further than the other defendants, for he had pleaded generally that all the matters charged as libellous were true; that the plaintiff had been guilty of perjury, and that he had been guilty of attempted extortion.—Sir James Scarlett admitted, that the plaintiff could have no case against Dr. Lushington, who was protected against being questioned for what he had said in the house, though not for publishing it out of the house, unless it were shewn that he had authorized the publication; but he was instructed he would be able to prove that Dr. Lushington corrected the speech with his own hand, and that the publication of the work was delayed to have his corrections.

The publication of the number of the Mirror of Parliament in question, was then proved against the other defendants. To connect Dr. Lushington with it, the plaintiff called Mr. Henry Bacon the sub-editor of the “ Mirror of Parliament,” during the Session of 1828, who was examined, with a view to show, that Dr. Lushington had authorized the publication of the speeches in question; but he denied all knowledge on the subject.—Mr. John Dickens stated, that he had been employed at the office of the “ Mirror of Parliament.” He remembered the publication of the last number of that work for the Session of 1828. It was delayed for about a week, in



consequence of the proofs of Dr. Lushington's speech having been sent to that gentleman. It was sent by a messenger from the office, and its return was delayed, as witness understood, in consequence of Dr. Lushington being out of town. Witness sent frequent messages to get it back. As soon as it was returned, it was sent to the printers. There were two speeches of Dr. Lushington's contained in the number now produced. Witness was not aware that the first was sent to the doctor. The reason of the speech being sent to Dr. Lushington was, that a number of subscribers in Doctors' Commons were anxious to have that gentleman's speech given correctly. Dr. Lushington was a subscriber to the *Mirror*, or he would not have been entitled to have the speech sent to him for correction.—Thomas Cope, who was in the employment of Mr. Clowes, the printer of the *Mirror*, said he had some vague recollection of the last number for 1828 having been delayed. The reason was, the lingering way in which the business was at that time conducted in the House of Commons, which was about to adjourn. Witness did not remember receiving any proof sheets of Dr. Lushington's speech with corrections by the doctor. The manuscripts were generally preserved, but those of 1828 had been destroyed about a twelvemonth ago, when the building in which they were deposited was pulled down.—For the defendants, the Attorney General maintained, that there was no evidence to touch Dr. Lushington. There was evidence that some of the proofs were sent to him, but what part of them did not appear, or that they were not returned from him in the very state in which they

went to him; and there was nothing to show, if they went sealed to his chambers, crowded as those chambers were with the papers of his numerous clients, that they did not return into the hands of the printers sealed up in the same manner, never opened and never corrected by him. For the other defendants he insisted, that the publication was a true report of what passed in the House of Commons, and though the publication was, no doubt, a breach of privilege, for which his clients might have been called to the Bar of the House, and severely reprimanded, the present plaintiff had no just ground of complaint. He had excited the discussion by his own improper acts. He had been guilty of a gross abuse of the right of petitioning. The very contents of the petition proved that the petition was his, not his client's. It was made the vehicle of most atrocious and unfounded charges against the Judge, Sir John Nichol; and the House of Commons, after the matter was discussed, had refused to receive it. The defendants had no evidence in support of their plea, that the charges were true.—Lord Tenterden told the Jury, that members of Parliament could not be questioned in that or any other Court of Justice for any matter which might fall from them in either House. But the liberty was confined to that which passed in the House; for if a member of either house of Parliament thought fit, after he had made a speech, to publish it, and it were found to contain a libel upon the character of another, he must be answerable, because his character as a member of Parliament did not give him the privilege of publishing what he might there say. As the speaker himself,



therefore, was not privileged out of the House, neither could any other person; for that, which it was not lawful for him who originally uttered it to publish, could not be lawfully published by any other person. A verdict must pass for Dr. Lushington, as there was not a tittle of evidence to connect him with the publication. As to the other three defendants, they were proved to be the editor and publishers, and the work had been bought at their office, and that being proved, the Jury could not do otherwise than find a verdict for the plaintiff against those defendants. They could hardly suppose that the defendants had any personal malice against the plaintiff, but at the same time they were answerable for the consequences of the publication. The question of damages was entirely for the Jury. The Jury, after conferring together for about ten minutes, found a verdict for the plaintiff. — Damages 50*l.* — Lord Tenterden then directed the verdict to be entered for the defendant, Dr. Lushington, on the plea of *Not Guilty*; and discharged the Jury from giving any verdict on the other issues joined with the defendant. The verdict was entered generally against the other defendants.

**GREAT FLOODS.** — The Snow-storm in the first days of the month having been followed by a sudden thaw, the Clyde rose, at Glasgow, to a greater height than had been seen for many years. On the morning of the 8th, quantities of ice began to float down the river, which by 2 o'clock had increased to an alarming extent. The whole surface of the water, from bank to bank, was covered with large shoals of ice, increasing

as the waters continued to swell; and, by half-past four o'clock, it was floating down in such immense quantities, that there was scarcely room in the bed of the river for it to proceed. Immediately below the Broomielaw-bridge, an immense collection of ice became completely jammed together, from the contraction caused in the passage by the shipping on the south side of the river; and at last opened a way for itself, by forcing from its moorings the first vessel in the range. This vessel struck against the others, till at last the whole range were violently driven across the river, an iron pall, to which some of them were attached, having given way. The unmoored vessels were driven to the north side of the river with dreadful violence, where the concussion was followed by betwixt 30 and 40 vessels being successively forced from their fastenings down the river; crash after crash was heard, as the loosened vessels came in collision with those placed further down the quay, and it, at one period, appeared as if the whole of the shipping in the harbour had been doomed to destruction. The water, which was at this time very much swollen, bore away the vessels with tremendous velocity, in spite of every exertion made to retain them. In a great many, there were no hands on board. Every kind of vessel that lay in the way was borne forwards, including small boats as well as rafts of wood. At least three vessels were sunk. In the lower part of the city, the river rose, in the course of the 9th, to the depth of from four to five feet, and boats and carts had to be employed in removing the inhabitants, or conveying provisions to those who



lived in the upper floors. At 3 p.m. on the 9th, the water became stationary, and remained so for an hour and a half, when it began to subside. When at its highest, it was twenty-three and a-half inches lower than the great flood on the 12th of March, 1782, and one inch higher than the flood of 1823.

On the 9th, the river Tay rose to a greater height than had been known in the memory of man. At Perth, a fleet of vessels, chiefly laden with potatoes, were driven from their moorings, but, after great exertions, were hauled into deep water, without having sustained material injury. The inundation was in a quarter where it was least expected—the western or upper suburbs. The inhabitants of Clayholes, New Row, and County Place, were suddenly raised from their slumbers, the waters, in many houses, having risen to the height of three and four feet, and many were rescued with considerable difficulty. Even after an outlet was effected, the water in the New Row and County Place continued, from side to side of the street, to run like a river. In 1814, the town was inundated to a greater extent; but that arose, not so much from the quantity of water, as from the obstruction presented by the ice.

The Tweed and Teviot began to rise on the evening of the 8th. On the 9th, both rivers were swollen far beyond the boundaries of their highest floods, and the whole country in the line of their course, especially below their junction, presented the appearance, not merely of the inundations of an ordinary river, but of an extensive estuary; all the rich haughs were covered with water many feet deep, and in many places

the fields on the water-sides could not be defined but by the tops of the hedge-row trees which were still seen above the water. The oldest inhabitants on Tweed-side never before knew that river pour forth such a mighty torrent. A great portion of the fine park of Fleurs, and the whole of St. James's Green opposite, were covered many feet deep; the outer wall of the Duke of Roxburghe's old gardens was overtopped some yards, and the inner wall, with the fruit-trees growing against it, were deep in the water. At Kelso, the Tweed rose full twenty feet perpendicular, and great fears were entertained for the bridge, the torrent reaching far above the opening of the arches. The Coldstream-road at the bridge, across Eden-water, was impassable the whole of the day, the coaches being obliged to go round by Ednam.

In England, the Severn rose so high on the 9th, that a barge-man, in a fishing coracle, sailed for a wager over the town-walls at Roushill, near Shrewsbury. In some of the houses the water was from six to seven feet deep on the floor, and in some cottages at Roushill, it covered the first story almost to the ceiling; Hay-stacks, timber, and out-lying agricultural implements, were swept off in one general ruin, and even dwelling-houses and out-buildings shared the same fate.

At York, on the 10th, the waters of the Ouse and Foss rose higher than they had been for 200 years, and all the lower parts of the city were completely inundated.

10. MASTER AND SERVANT.—COMMON PLEAS.—*Kelsey v. Burnett*.—This was an action brought by the plaintiff, a mariner on board the Scaleby Castle, East



Indiaman, against the defendant, who was the captain of that vessel, to recover compensation in damages for having, without sufficient cause, twice inflicted corporal punishment upon the plaintiff, and caused him to be put in irons, during a voyage from England to China, in 1829. The defendant pleaded in justification, that on the first occasion when the plaintiff was punished, he had been drunk; and on the second, he had been guilty of an offence against good order and morals, which required that he should be kept apart from the rest of the crew, as well as punished for his misconduct.

The facts were these:—the plaintiff was one of the Marine-society boys, about sixteen or seventeen years of age, whose first voyage was the one in question. He was appointed to attend on the surgeon; and one night, when the vessel was between the Line and the Cape, he went to sleep without putting up the surgeon's hammock as usual, for which he was called to account, and was at the same time charged with being drunk. On the following morning he was, by the captain's orders, lashed to the gang-way, and flogged with a cat-o'-nine-tails, in the same way in which children are flogged at school. When the boatswain's mate had given him a dozen lashes he stopped; and the captain told the plaintiff, he hoped that would be a warning to him in future, asking him, at the same time, how he liked it? The boy replied, in angry voice, that he had never been served so before, or cut about in that manner; on which the captain ordered the boatswain's mate to give him another half-dozen, and lay into him smartly. This half-dozen were administered

with more severity than the preceding dozen, but still the skin was merely made red, and not broken. With respect to this part of the case there was very conflicting evidence; the witnesses for the plaintiff swearing that he was perfectly sober on the night in question, and those for the defendant (and they were very numerous) that he was drunk. The plaintiff continued to wait upon the surgeon until the vessel reached China, when the surgeon one day discovered two indecent words written on the inside of the medicine-chest. Knowing that nobody had any right to enter his cabin but his mate and the plaintiff, he immediately taxed the latter with having written the obnoxious words. The plaintiff denied it; and the surgeon sent for the sick-list, and comparing the plaintiff's writing with the words on the medicine-chest, again taxed him with being the writer of them. Here again there was contradictory evidence; according to the surgeon's testimony, the plaintiff admitted being the writer, and the writing was like his; whilst, according to others, he persisted in his denial of being the writer, and the writing was not similar to his. He was reported to the captain, who put him in irons on Sunday, and on Monday caused him to receive, in the presence of the other marine boys, two and a half-dozen lashes in the same manner as on the former occasion, except that they appeared to have been inflicted with somewhat more severity. On neither occasion had any form of inquiry taken place, nor was the second punishment entered in the captain's journal.—The Lord Chief Justice left it to the Jury to say,



whether or not the pleas had been made out to their satisfaction ; because if so, it did not appear to him that the punishment was at all disproportioned to the offence on either occasion, except, perhaps, as to the putting the plaintiff in irons, which did not seem to have been called for by the circumstances ; but even if the punishment had been as excessive as it appeared to have been moderate, he thought, that as the plaintiff had not replied the excess, if the pleas of justification were proved, the defendant was entitled to a verdict.—The Jury, after a few minutes' deliberation, returned a verdict for the plaintiff—*Damages 50l.*

#### 15. MURDER AND SUICIDE.—

An Inquest was held in Dublin, on the bodies of two children of a watchman, named Michael Lynch, said to have been murdered by their own father, who immediately cut his own throat.—Before the Coroner, the mother stated, “ My husband was dismissed a few days ago. The eldest of our children was two years, and the other about eight months old ; this morning my husband got up for a short time, and went in again to bed ; I went out for a little bread ; when I came back he was stretched on the floor, and my two children were dead. I did not think any thing was done to them, till I saw them in their blood ; I covered them up with a blanket, for I could not bear to look on them ; he asked me to get a glass to knock the grief off of him ; I told him I would, but he did not take it ; he was sighing for the last two nights ; he never was a passionate man : he was, I think, about forty years of age ; he was very fond of his children ; it was with a razor the deed was done ; I was about a quarter

of an hour out ; when I came back he was just breathing, but the children were quite dead ; I and my husband lived quietly together ; we always lived on good terms ; my youngest child I was just after giving the breast to, when I went out, and I found her lying in the same way I left her.”—William Hogan ; About half-past eight I heard of this circumstance ; I ran out and saw Mrs. Lynch ; I ran up ; I saw him lying on the floor, and the children in the bed ; he was breathing, and they were quite dead ; I sent the surgeons to them ; he was in gores of blood, with nothing on him but his shirt ; the eldest child was lying on one side of the bed, and the other over near the wall.—Edward Cherry ; I live in the watch-house near this ; I heard of this circumstance near nine o'clock ; the first thing I saw was the man breathing, and the children with their faces to me, and they dead ; Surgeon Todd told me he thought Lynch could speak : on holding up his head, he said to Surgeon Todd, “ what do you want to say to me ? I was dismissed the other day.” Mr. Todd said, “ I suppose you are sorry for what you have done,” and he said “ Yes.” I found the razor lying on the box ; it was covered with blood, and appeared to have been laid down quite deliberately.—Peace-officer Cannon ; On my arriving at Lynch's house, I gave every assistance ; the surgeons were there ; his throat was sewed up ; he asked to speak to his wife ; she was brought in ; he asked her, “ would she forgive him ?” she said “ she would, and hoped God would forgive him ;” he then said, “ My children !”—“ they are dead !” she said ; we then brought her away, and would not allow her to



see him any more.—The Jury returned a verdict to the effect that the deaths of the two children were caused by their father.

19. QUACK DOCTORS.—OLD BAILEY SESSIONS.—Mr. St. John Long was charged with feloniously assaulting the person of Mrs. Colin Campbell Lloyd, which caused her death. In another count he was charged with having feloniously killed and slayed the said Colin Campbell Lloyd by rubbing her with some ointment or mixture secretly prepared. There were several other counts in the indictment, in which the form of the offence was varied.—The following witnesses were called:—Edward Lloyd, Esq.; Is a post-captain in the navy; the late Mrs. Lloyd was his wife. The first time he saw the prisoner was in an evening about the 1st of June, when he met him in a casual manner at a private house. He saw the prisoner also at the inquest on Miss Cashin, who died, while under the prisoner's treatment in September last, and in respect of whose death a verdict of manslaughter had been given against him. Mrs. Lloyd consulted him respecting a sort of choking sensation which attacked her occasionally, especially when she caught cold. Witness accompanied her to the prisoner's house; the first time might be a fortnight before she put herself under his care. She first inhaled on the 6th of October. She went to prisoner's house every day after the 6th, witness accompanying her. On the 9th, she was rubbed upon the breast, &c.: but witness did not see it. On the night of the 10th she complained of a very violent, alarming pain on the chest; upon which witness examined it. There appeared a great redness all

over the breast, which was darker in the middle than any other part; she also complained of chilliness and shivering with cold, and she had a very restless and uncomfortable night. The next morning she was much worse, and could scarcely leave the bed; she complained of great sickness. The redness had by that time got more livid, and the hole in the centre darker. The edges of the wound were much puffed up, and there was a discharge from the centre. Cabbage-leaves were applied to the wound by the order, as witness understood, of the prisoner. He did not call on the Monday; indeed witness was not aware that he knew where they lived. Mrs. Lloyd passed the Monday night very uncomfortably. On Tuesday morning witness again saw her breast and chest. The redness was then greater, and the wound was larger and darker, the edges of the wound were much puffed up, and there was a discharge from the centre. Cabbage-leaves were still applied to the wound, by the order, as witness understood, of the prisoner. The inner part of the arms was also red. Wherever the discharge had gone the skin appeared very much irritated. Indeed, wherever that discharge had gone, the flesh mortified, and was taken off. This, however, was some days afterwards. At the end of a week or ten days, the smell became very bad. Mrs. Lloyd at this time felt very feverish and ill. Witness afterwards saw Mr. Long, who inquired how it was Mrs. Lloyd had not called; he told him, that since the Sunday she had been too ill to go out, and had suffered considerable pain. The prisoner said, that he dared say that would soon go off,



as such was generally the case. I told him of the chilliness she had suffered, and that we had given her some hot wine and water to relieve it. He said hot brandy and water would have been a better thing, and she should put her head under the bed-clothes. I also told him of the bad appearance of the breast and chest also; I did not describe it so minutely as I have now. He said, that was generally the case in the first instance, but that it would go off as she got better. I requested him to call upon her in the evening, telling him where I lived. He came, and I was present when he saw Mrs. Lloyd. When we went into the room the prisoner said, that he was sorry to see her so unwell. She ought to have endeavoured to have got up and gone to him, and he would have relieved her. She stated, that it was impossible for her so to do, she was in such pain and suffering, and with her breast open in that way it might be dangerous. He then asked to look at it, which he did. He said, those greasy plaisters had no business there; the plaisters he alluded to, she had put on herself; that she ought to have continued using the cabbage-leaf. She replied, that she could not bear the pain. He then took off his great coat, and said, he would rub it out, which would give her great relief, and he turned up the cuffs of his coat, as though preparing to do so. She exclaimed with terror, at the thought of such a thing. He had something in a small flask. I asked him if there were no way to give her relief without touching her breasts, as she could not bear them touched. He asked, what she wished? she replied, to be healed. He said, it would never heal with greasy plais-

ters; that was not the way to heal sores, or wounds, I don't know which. He called for a towel, which I gave him, and he began dabbing it on the bosom, particularly on the centre of the wound, from which the discharge came. This discharge came only from the centre. He said, old linen was the best thing to heal a thing of that kind; but she said, that she had always been in the habit of using the simple dressing she had then applied. He called again the next day. Mrs. Lloyd at that time was suffering intense pain, and was in very low spirits; she also had a great deal of fever, and was very nervous, fearing any thing should touch her breast. He did not see her that day; she was frightened at his very name, and could not see him! in fact, he never saw her again. Mr. Campbell, a medical gentleman, was then called in, and he saw her several times every day. Mr. Vance was also called in. Mrs. Lloyd died on the 8th of November, exactly one month and one day after she had been rubbed by Mr. Long. — Cross-examined by Mr. Alley; Mrs. Lloyd lived at Mr. Campbell's mother's house, during the whole time she attended Mr. Long, and she died there. Mr. Campbell saw her on the day previously to the prisoner seeing her for the last time. When Mr. Long saw her, he complained of improper applications being administered. He said it was what he was not in the habit of using. He told her, that they would not heal the sore. When Mr. Long proposed to rub it out, witness understood him not to mean to rub out the grease, but the application he had formerly rubbed in. He did not complain of the effects of the plaister, but of the application



of it. He wished the cabbage-leaves to have been continued. About ten or twelve days after Mr. Campbell attended Mrs. Lloyd, Mr. Vance was called in, he being for that time her only medical attendant.—By Baron Bayley; Mrs. Lloyd paid the prisoner two fees of one pound each. I cannot say how it happened, when she was in such a state of irritation, that I did not send for the prisoner. I should think that the plaister, of which she complained, had not been on more than two hours. The cabbage-leaves had been on before.—Mrs. E. Lloyd was then examined; She had known Captain and Mrs. Lloyd from their infancy. Mrs. Lloyd was a very healthy woman, subject, however, to an unpleasant attack in her throat. Remembers the Sunday evening she complained of indisposition. That was the first symptom of illness I perceived. She complained of great shiverings. I sat with her many hours that evening, and the symptoms increased, instead of going off. I did not retire till about two o'clock in the morning, and I saw her again about half-past nine on the Monday morning. She then complained of soreness on her stomach, which I saw. It was very much inflamed all over. The witness then gave a similar description of the wounds to that detailed by Captain Lloyd.—Mr. W. A. Campbell examined by the Attorney-General; I am a surgeon. I knew Mrs. Lloyd for many years. She appeared to me to be a very healthy person. I saw her on a Tuesday about four o'clock in the afternoon by my mother's request, in consequence of her suffering great pain in her breast. She appeared to be in great agony, and from the appear-

ance of the breast, she must have been suffering great pain. On examination, I found a very extensive wound covering the whole material part of the breast. I should think a very strong acid would produce such a wound. The skin was entirely destroyed, and laid separated in folds on the chest. There was a considerable discharge from the whole of the wound, which extended nearly from one arm-pit to the other; the skin was off both the breasts. The discharge was of a dark colour. I applied a dressing, having, I rather think, removed the cabbage leaves previously to doing so. It was simple spermaceti ointment, the usual dressing in that case.—I saw her again on the following day, and daily till her death, always twice, or even oftener. From the moment I saw the wound, I thought it very dangerous to life. I continued the application of the ointment, which was the only dressing I used until I saw Mr. Vance. He applied the same dressings, with the addition of a small quantity of calomel powder. On the second or third day Mr. Vance prescribed the application of a poultice. It was a common bread and water poultice. Neither Mr. Vance nor myself applied any thing that was calculated to increase the danger. Mr. Vance was called in on the 21st, when I correctly described to him the treatment that I pursued. At one time there was some slight hope entertained of her recovery; but, for my part, I always entertained great fears. I administered some internal medicines—the first was a saline aperient mixture—after that, bark and wine, and mineral acids. That would tend to repel mortification. Mortification began about a week after I



first attended her. In my judgment Mrs. Lloyd died of the wound I saw when I first attended her. Up to the time Mr. Vance was called in I applied simple dressings, and nothing else. The moment I saw the wound I stated to her friends my opinion of its dangerous nature. I told her sister of it three or four days afterwards. I attended her on the 12th of October, and she died on the 8th of November, during which time Mr. Long had no opportunity of prescribing for her. In his opinion it was not necessary to produce such a wound to correct any difficulty in swallowing. He knew of no disease whatever in which it could be proper.—Mr. Vance, a surgeon, residing in Sackville Street. He was called in to attend Mrs. Lloyd on the 21st of October. She was in bed, and Mr. Campbell was present. She complained of extreme soreness of the throat, and ascribed it to having inhaled through a tube at Mr. Long's. This witness gave a similar description of the wound as in the preceding evidence. When he first saw her he thought that it proceeded from a narrow passage into the stomach, but he ascertained afterwards that it was *globus hystericus*. It was a complaint very usual to females in early life; he had never known it prove fatal, and he had seen many thousand cases of it. A wound on the chest would not relieve such a complaint. He attended the opening of the body. The whole body, both internally and externally, was in a state of perfect health, with the exception of a disease of the thyroid gland, and affection of the inside of the windpipe, but there was no occasion for such a wound. In his opinion, those parts were

healthy until the ulcer had been created. There was no thickening of the part. He believed that her death was caused by mortification arising from inflammation, which had been produced by some powerful application. By a Juror; Could you have prevented the death, had you been called in before the 12th of November?—I should like to be excused giving any answer—it is a very difficult question; but it is not likely that I could have saved the patient. By a Juror; Could you, from what Mr. Campbell told you, have prevented her death if you had seen her sooner?—I have admitted the propriety of Mr. Campbell's treatment; and, therefore, every thing that I think could have been done was done.—Mr. Brodie examined by the Attorney-General; Knew of no disease that could have called for the application of any liniment that would produce such an effect intentionally. From the evidence he heard Mr. Campbell give, it did not appear to him that any other treatment would have produced a better effect.—Richard Franklin, a surgeon, stated, that he saw the deceased about a week previous to her death, and also, attended the *post mortem* examination of her body. He did not observe any peculiarity in her constitution to account for the violent effect produced by the applications used by the prisoner.

The prisoner, when called upon for his defence, said, he had a written defence prepared, but which he, by the advice of his counsel, would decline reading. He then proceeded to complain of the publications that had issued from the press, for the purpose of exciting a prejudice against him, and implored the jury not to pay any attention to them,



He had succeeded in curing many persons who, but for the benefit of his advice, would long ere this have been in their graves.—He should call many of these persons as witnesses, and he entreated the jury to pay particular attention to their evidence. Had he been allowed to continue his attendance on the deceased, and had she followed the course he had advised, he had no doubt he should have cured her; but Mr. Campbell was called, who adopted a course of medicine directly contrary to his. Mrs. Campbell's feelings towards him (prisoner) would be evident from a declaration she made, to the effect, that it was a hard case that he should be getting his 12,000*l.* a-year, while her son could scarcely get any thing. He had treated the deceased with all the skill and attention in his power, and there was no evidence that her death had been occasioned by any act of his. The prisoner concluded, after some general observations on the evidence, by expressing his confidence that the jury would return a verdict in his favour. A great number of witnesses of the highest respectability were then examined, who stated that they had been under the care of the prisoner, and each of them expressed their entire satisfaction at his general mode of treatment, and their opinion of his skill and ability.—Mr. Justice Bailey told the Jury, that they must be satisfied, that the application was made by the prisoner feloniously, by that he meant, with gross and culpable rashness, before they convicted him; that the application was the cause of the death of the deceased, and also that the application showed a want of skill and attention on the part of the prisoner.—The Jury,

after an absence of an hour, returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*.—As soon as the verdict was pronounced several elegantly dressed ladies went to the prisoner and shook him cordially by the hand. He was ordered to be immediately discharged, and left the Court in company with some of his friends.

22. RIOTS.—On the morning of Tuesday the 22nd, a party of 3000 miners, collected from the parishes of Breage, Gwennap, Crowan, Wendron, &c., passed through Helston in complete order, for the avowed purpose of preventing further shipments of corn at Helford. Near Mawgan, they were met by H. Grylls, esq., on his way from Bosahan, who entreated them to return, but they would not. One of their leaders said, "If you, Sir, will go with us, we will not do any mischief; but if you do not, perhaps we shall be unruly." Finding all his endeavours to induce them to return useless, Mr. Grylls and Mr. Black accompanied them to Geer, where were deposited about 150 bushels of barley, which the proprietor promised should be sent to the Helston market on Saturday. They next proceeded to Treath, near Helford, and found only a small quantity; there, also, a promise was given that it should not be shipped, but brought to market. From thence they went to Gilling, where they found in Mr. Roskruge's cellars, several hundred bushels of barley and wheat. Four of the leaders entered the cellars, and measured the depth, length, and breadth of each pile of corn, and computed the quantity. Having been promised by the son of Mr. Roskruge that all the barley should be sent to the market, they set out for their



homes without committing any acts of violence. Near Mawgan, Mr. Grylls addressed them, and begged them to return peaceably; this they promised to do, and immediately gave him three cheers. About five o'clock in the evening, they entered Helston in perfect order. They declared, that their only object was to obtain an adequate supply of barley at the different markets on the 25th. As some corn was being carried through Breage, to Penzance, a great body of people, mostly females, supposing it was about to be shipped, stopped the waggons, from which they took the corn, but without committing any depredations on it. Subsequently, on finding that it was to be ground at a mill at Penzance, they carefully housed it, and on Monday delivered it to persons sent to fetch it, without any part of it being missing.

22. COMBINATION RIOTS. — The miners in the neighbourhood of St. Blazey having formed combinations for the purpose of superseding, in a great measure, the authority of the agents and the regulations of the mines, early on the morning of the 22nd, a great number of men collected at Fowey Consols and Lanescot mines, and attempted to seize two men who had refused to enter into any combination, and who, from the threats of summary punishment being inflicted on them, had been compelled to take refuge in the counting-house of these mines. The agents, after waiting a considerable time for the dispersion of this assemblage, were obliged to appeal to the magistrates. The latter, after entreating the miners without effect to disperse, read the riot act, and, on the expiring of the hour, as the mob did

not disperse, seven of them were ordered to be taken into custody. On the prisoners being put into chaises for conveyance to prison, a violent attempt to rescue them was made by several hundred persons; but after a long conflict they were carried to Bodmin. Next day their comrades assembled in great numbers to attempt their rescue from the gaol of Bodmin. The High Sheriff and the neighbouring Magistrates repaired to that place early in the day, and swore in between thirty and forty special constables. The staff of the royal Cornwall militia were also called out, and were placed on duty in and round the prison. On the 24th, a motley crowd of rioters entered the town. They sent a deputation, consisting of six or seven persons, to the High Sheriff, at the gaol, to explain their object. The Sheriff reasoned with them on the consequences of their conduct, and sent them back to their comrades. On their return they were accompanied by some of the respectable inhabitants, who reasoned with the mob, and at length induced them to depart. As a reward for this peaceable demeanour, the persons who spoke to them gave each a pint of beer and a penny loaf, which they thankfully received.

25. THUNDER STORM. — On Sunday, the 25th, a peal of thunder burst over the parish of Kilmichael, of Glassire. The lightning, entering the spire of the church, rent it from top to bottom, and forced out some of the stones from the inner side in its progress. The session-house is in the steeple, and has a door communicating with it from the church: this also was rent. In its way to the church, the lightning made two holes in the



roof, one on each side of the pulpit, and broke the glass of the windows on that side; it also struck the loft and shattered it, and came out at the west window; the glass of which it likewise destroyed.

26. MURDER.—DURHAM ASSIZES.—Thomas Clarke, aged 19, was indicted for the wilful murder of Mary Ann Westropp, at Pitlington, in the county of Durham. From the evidence, it appeared that the prisoner and the deceased lived together in the service of Mr. Oliver, of Hallgarthmill, which is situated between the villages of Sherbourne and Pitlington. On the morning of the 14th of August, Mr. and Mrs. Oliver went from home, leaving the house in care of the prisoner and the deceased. In the course of the afternoon of the 14th they were seen by several persons, and the prisoner, in reply to an answer which the deceased gave him, was heard to say, he thought her very saucy, but he would be straight with her before night. About six o'clock the same evening, the prisoner alarmed the neighbourhood, stating that six men had broken into the mill, and killed the girl, and very nigh killed him. The body of the deceased was found behind the kitchen door, with a contused wound on the forehead, the ear cut through, and an incision extending across the throat, and dividing the carotid artery and jugular vein on the right side. On examining the premises, twenty-two sovereigns, and about 15*l.* in silver, belonging to Mr. Oliver, were discovered to have been stolen. The drawers, in which they had been deposited, had been broken open by means of a piece of metal, which had been white-washed, and was found near

them, and fitted exactly the marks in the drawers. It was proved, that the prisoner's room had been recently white-washed, and that at that time the piece of metal was lying in a blank window in his room. The money was subsequently discovered in one of the drawers concealed in some standing corn. The prisoner stated, that the men who entered the house had attacked him with the poker, and that he had escaped with difficulty; but the witnesses, who saw him immediately after the alarm had been given, could not discover any marks of violence on him, and his box, which was in the next room to that from which the money was taken, had not been touched.—On being called on for his defence, the prisoner declared that he was innocent of the crime, and several witnesses gave him a good character.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*, and sentence of death was pronounced upon him.—He was executed on the 28th. On the scaffold, he said to the multitude, “Gentlemen, I am innocent; I am suffering for another man's crimes;” after which he sobbed audibly.

26. THEFT.—SURREY SESSIONS.—Samuel Marden, a coal-merchant, was indicted for stealing a fur tippet, value 17*s.*, the property of Angel Boxsius, a furrier. The trial of the prisoner excited an extraordinary degree of interest, owing to the singularity of the circumstances attending the charge, and attracted a crowded court during the proceedings, which lasted from ten until five o'clock in the afternoon.—Angel Boxsius stated, that, on the 28th of January last, the prisoner called at his shop, relative to the delivery of some coals with which he had supplied him.



Previously to the arrival of the prisoner, he had removed a fur tippet, which was on the counter near the door, to a desk at the upper end of the shop, close to the parlour window. The prisoner remained there about an hour and a half altogether, and was enveloped in a cloak. During some part of the time the prisoner was left alone in the shop, the boy having been sent to an adjoining street to borrow a shovel. When the boy returned, the prisoner took the shovel in one hand, and, with the other underneath his cloak, turned over a few shovelfull of coals, in order to let the prosecutor see the quality of them, and he left the shop soon afterwards, the time he went away being about a quarter after six o'clock in the evening: the shop was closed at nine o'clock. There were three ladies called at the shop during the time the prisoner was there, but they did not approach that part where the tippet was placed. Prosecutor missed the tippet the next morning, and did not hear any thing about it until the afternoon of the 14th inst., when, while standing at the door, he observed a young lady pass with the tippet in question on her shoulders; and, in explanation of the manner in which it had come into her possession, she said that it had been sent to her by Mr. Marden, on the 29th of January, with a letter, begging her acceptance of it. The prisoner was subsequently taken into custody, and then stated that he had purchased the tippet of an aged man on the morning of the 29th of January, near the Elephant and Castle, as he was proceeding from his residence to his office in Montagu-close, adding, that the man offered it for 10s., but that he ultimately let him

have it for 7s. The prosecutor added, that Stowell, a parish constable, a man named Morris, and his wife, were examined at Union-hall, when the prisoner was taken before the magistrates there.—The prosecutor, in his cross-examination, admitted that he was not present in the shop during the whole time the prisoner was there, neither was his wife, who was occupied in the kitchen. The prisoner did not use the large shovel, which would have required both hands, but the small one, with one hand, while the other remained under his cloak. Did not state to a man named Riddlestopper, that if Bootch, his workman, had stolen the tippet, he would not get him into a scrape; neither did he tell Cole, a policeman, that he did not wish to press the charge against the prisoner, he being a respectable man and having plenty of money. Did not say to Stowell, the constable, that if the prisoner was not prosecuted, it would make a good job for them.—The identity of the tippet was here proved by a young woman who had made the alterations in it for one of the prosecutor's customers.—Miss Jarrod, the young lady to whom the tippet was sent by the prisoner, described, as already detailed, the manner in which it had come into her possession.

The prisoner being called on for his defence, put in a written statement, which was read by the Clerk of the Court, declaring that he was innocent of the offence with which he was charged, and that he had purchased the tippet in the way already alluded to.

Mr. Morris, a dyer, was then called, and he stated, that, on the morning of the 29th of January, an old man called at his shop, and



offered the tippet now produced for sale. Witness knew the tippet, from the crimson lining to it, which had spots on it. He did not perceive what description of fur it was, and the man who had it for sale, seeing that he had no disposition to become a purchaser, then left the shop. On the 15th inst., Stowell, the constable, called on witness, who described to him the colour of the tippet lining, and gave him also a description of the person who had offered it for sale. Witness had no acquaintance whatever with the prisoner up to the time of this transaction, and had no motive on earth for coming forward, except to state that which was true relative to all he knew about the matter. In the witness's cross-examination, he stated, that his recollection of the day on which the tippet was offered for sale at his shop, was owing to some ladies having called at his shop at the time, who saw the article as well as himself, but he had not their address, otherwise he would have brought them forward to corroborate his evidence.—Joseph Williams, the porter who was employed in shooting the coals at the prosecutor's house on the afternoon the tippet was stolen, stated, that he saw the prisoner use the large shovel with both hands, and that his cloak was thrown back in such a manner over his shoulders, that, if he had any thing concealed previously, it must then have been discovered.—Stowell, the constable, into whose custody the prisoner was given in the first instance, stated, that the prosecutor said to him that he knew the prisoner to be a respectable man, having plenty of money, and that they (meaning himself and witness) had better make a "job" than take him

before a magistrate. The witness added, that Mr. Morris had described to him the age and appearance of the man who had offered the tippet for sale at his shop, when he (Stowell) went there to make inquiry about the transaction.—In his cross-examination, the witness admitted that he accompanied the prisoner to his house on the evening he took him into custody, and that he drank a glass of gin and water there at his invitation. Did not tell the magistrates at Union-hall that the prosecutor had attempted to compromise the case; did intend to do so, but was stopped.—Mr. Elyard, who was on the bench, on hearing the witness's reply, seemed amazed at it, and rising, said, "I was at Union-hall the day of the examination, and can vouch that the magistrates present (Mr. Hone and Mr. Murray) were quite willing to listen to the whole of the witnesses who came forward on that occasion, and it is most extraordinary that such a statement as that now made by the witness should have been withheld until this day. It would have been a most important fact on behalf of the accused, and I repeat, it only surprises me it should have been kept back until now."—Witness's cross-examination continued.—Told prosecutor that he (witness) would not consent to become a party to any compromise, but that he should do his duty, and take the prisoner before a magistrate.—The prosecutor, who was sitting in Court, on hearing Stowell's assertions with respect to a compromise, suddenly rose up from his seat, and with great earnestness of manner exclaimed, "The witness is per-juring himself, I never suggested or thought of compromising the



case."—Thomas Cole, a policeman, into whose custody the prisoner was handed over by Stowell, stated that, on the 14th inst., the prosecutor said to him, "I don't wish to indict Mr. Marden, he has plenty of money, and if you keep out of the way, you will be well paid for your trouble." The witness added, that he refused to take the advice of the prosecutor, saying to him on that occasion, "If it was a poor man, you would follow up the case to the utmost, but as Mr. Marden is rich, you don't wish to prosecute, for the sake of getting money by it."—The witness, in his cross-examination, said, that he had not made known that which he had now stated, to the Inspector or any body else, until within the last two or three days. He had no object in view in keeping it a secret for so long a time, neither did he mention it when before the magistrates at Union-hall.—Some surprise was manifested by the Court and Jury, that this witness had also kept back such important evidence until within the last few days.—Mrs. Morris, the wife of the witness of that name, stated, that, on the 29th of January, she saw a man offer a tippet for sale to her husband in the shop. She was unable, however, to describe either the man who offered it, whether he was old or young, or the kind of fur or lining of the tippet.—A Mr. Riddlestopper stated that he was a furrier, and that the prosecutor called on him on Tuesday last, and, in allusion to this case, said, "If poor old Joe (meaning a workman) stole the tippet, I should not like to get him in trouble."—In the course of the trial, a good deal had been said about an old man named Joe Bootch, who was in the prosecutor's employ, and who was at one

period suspected of being the person who was alleged to have offered the tippet for sale, under the circumstances detailed by the prisoner in his defence, and also as represented by the witness Morris. Bootch, however, appeared on the trial, and was exonerated from the stigma, neither Mr. Morris nor the prisoner alleging that he was the person.—A great number of highly respectable merchants and tradesmen gave the prisoner an excellent character; and, after the Chairman had summed up the evidence, the Jury retired for an hour to deliberate, and on their return into Court, pronounced a verdict of *Not Guilty*.

---

### MARCH.

1. VICIOUS DOGS.—AYLESBURY ASSIZES.—*Wells v. Head*.—The plaintiff brought his action of trespass for shooting a dog. The defendant pleaded, that the dog, at the time he met with his death, was worrying his sheep, and that he shot him in their necessary protection. Both the parties were farmers at Ellesborough, and, on the 11th of March, 1830, the dog was in a field called the Mile Close, and was shot by the defendant, who at the time he fired the gun, was in an adjoining field called the Catskin.—For the defendant, witnesses were called, who stated that the dog had been for the last twelve months in the practice of chasing and worrying his sheep, whereof he had apprised the plaintiff. On the day in question, he had chased and seized the plaintiff's sheep in the rick-yard, which was two fields from that in which he was shot. After he had worried them in the rick-yard, he left that



place, traversed the Catskin, and had got into the Milefield, having entirely quitted the sheep.—Under these circumstances, Mr. Justice Alderson was of opinion, that the justification was not made out. If the defendant had found the dog worrying his sheep, and had no other mode of protecting his flock at the time, he would have been justified; but, as the dog had ceased to worry them, and had crossed a field and got into a third field at the time he was killed, the defendant had no right, in point of law, to follow him for the purpose of killing him.—Verdict for plaintiff—Damages, one guinea.

**ARSON. — WINCHESTER ASSIZES.**—John Sanson was indicted for having, on the 9th of December, 1828, maliciously set fire to certain farm-buildings, the property of John Buckland. It appeared from the evidence, that the fire had destroyed, not only the farm-buildings of Mr. Buckland, but also eight horses, seven pigs, some poultry, and a great quantity of corn and other articles.—James Hatcher, the brother-in-law of the prisoner, deposed, that, soon after the fire of 1828, the prisoner, in an agony of remorse, confessed to the witness his having set fire to the premises of Mr. Buckland. The prisoner stated at the same time, and was repeating it “for ever-lasting,” that he could have no rest in his mind in consequence of the crime which he had committed. The prisoner also told the witness that he had set fire to Farmer Buckland’s premises at the instigation of three other farmers, named George Spencer, Andrew Spencer (George’s brother), and Henry Cozens, who had come to him at Cozens’s barn, and told him

that they would give him a sovereign each for committing the crime. The prisoner was in the employment of George Spencer at the time of the alleged proposal, and they recommended to him to go to Cozens’s for a lantern. The prisoner had further confessed to the witness that he had committed the offence in company with James Spencer, a son of one of the Spencers abovenamed, and who was at that time in the employment of Henry Cozens. The witness mentioned to his mother the prisoner’s confession, and added, that it was a thing which “ought not to be concealed.” In answer to a question by Mr. Justice Taunton, he, however, admitted, that he never had stated the prisoner’s confession to any one besides his (witness’s) own mother for more than two years. — James Spencer, the person abovementioned, deposed, that, on the night of the burning, the prisoner came to him at Cozens’s, and asked him for the lantern, stating that he wanted to use it for setting fire to farmer Buckland’s premises. The witness attempted to dissuade the prisoner from the commission of the crime, but, on the repeated request of the prisoner, he gave him the lantern, and accompanied him to within a few yards of the buildings, where he remained until the fire broke out, when he ran off, and was soon overtaken by the prisoner, who deposited the lantern in a ditch. This witness also admitted that he had concealed his knowledge of the transaction until lately.—The Jury found the prisoner *Guilty*, and he was sentenced to death.

**4. POLITICAL TRICKS.**—**BOW STREET.**—Mr. C. Phillips made an application at this office for



summonses against the Chevalier D'Abreu-e-Lima, Ambassador to Donna Maria of Portugal, on the ground that certain despatches, which were forwarded on Friday last, by the government of Portugal, to Mr. Sampayo, the Consul-general of that country, under its present King, had been opened at the house of the Chevalier, where they had been left in mistake by the post-office messenger. It appeared, according to the statement of Mr. Phillips, that, on the morning of the day in question, the despatches were delivered at the house of the party complained against, and at ten o'clock on the same night they were left with the seals broken at Mr. Sampayo's house in Albemarle-street, by a gentleman who kept his handkerchief to his mouth as he delivered them to the servant. These despatches contained matter of the greatest importance, and were entirely of a secret nature. In fact, they related to the revolution in Portugal; and to prove in what manner the information had been used, it was only necessary to refer to the columns of a leading newspaper, where part of that identical correspondence appeared, in the shape of a private letter from Portugal. So clumsily had the fraud been effected, that the despatches which had been broken open were re-sealed again with the seal of the Ambassador of Donna Maria, thus affording evidence of the quarter in which the fraud had been practised. He, however, did not mean to bring any direct charge against any individual, but he applied on behalf of Mr. Sampayo for a summons against the porter at the house of the Chevalier D'Abreu-e-Lima, into whose hands the de-

spatches were delivered by the post-office messenger, in order that he should be compelled to account for their having been subsequently broken open. He asked also a summons against the Chevalier, to give evidence, that he might account why his seal should have been used in re-sealing the despatches. The magistrates, Sir R. Birnie, Mr. Minshull, and Mr. Halls, having ascertained that the packet was lighter by a quarter of an ounce than when it arrived at the post-office, notwithstanding the additional wax used in re-sealing it, inferred from that circumstance that some of the despatches had been purloined, and agreed that the summons should be issued. Mr. Sampayo made accordingly the necessary affidavit, and obtained summonses. The summonses, however, were afterwards countermanded by Mr. Minshull, the sitting magistrate, who, on further consideration, was of opinion that the case was one in which a magistrate had no jurisdiction. Next week, the application for summonses was renewed, Mr. Sampayo founding his application on the 42nd of George 3rd, cap. 81, sec. 4, which provides, "that, if any person shall wilfully secrete or detain any letter or packet forwarded through the General-post-office, and left by accident or mistake at the house of such person, he or she shall be liable to be fined or imprisoned." After some discussion, the clerk was directed to write to Sir Francis Freeling, requesting him to allow the letter-carriers and messengers to appear to give evidence touching this matter.

7. ROYAL VISIT TO COVENT GARDEN.—This evening their Majesties visited Covent Garden The-



atre, where they had commanded the performances. The doors were opened earlier than usual, and the house was immediately crowded in all parts. Soon after the spectators in the galleries had taken their seats, two printed placards, headed "Reform," and containing in large letters the words "Glorious King," were displayed in the front of the upper gallery. Another placard of the same kind was handed from the upper to the lower gallery, and had been displayed in the front of the latter only a short time, when a constable removed it. The placards from the upper gallery then disappeared. The appearance of those papers in no way disturbed the good-humour of the audience. Their Majesties entered their box, which was very splendidly arranged, shortly after seven o'clock. The Duke of Devonshire, Lord Winchester, and some other Lords, stood behind their Majesties' chairs.

8. FALSE IMPRISONMENT. — LANCASTER. — *Entwistle v. Norcliffe*. — This was an action of trespass and false imprisonment. The defendant pleaded that he was not guilty, and also a justification, alleging that the plaintiff had been in his service as clerk, and that he had embezzled a sum of money which he had received in his capacity as clerk; for which reason defendant caused him to be apprehended and carried before a magistrate. It appeared from the evidence, that the plaintiff was a zinc merchant, and had formerly been in the employment of Messrs. Hume & Co., extensive dealers in zinc, resident in London. In the year 1828, it occurred to the plaintiff that there was a good opportunity of establishing himself in Liver-

pool, as there was in that town no person who carried on a trade in zinc. Accordingly the plaintiff went to Liverpool, and by means of an advertisement, which he inserted in a newspaper, became acquainted with the defendant. After some negotiation they determined to commence a trade in zinc, and an agreement was drawn up, by which the defendant (after reciting that he had been appointed agent for Messrs. Hume & Co. of London) agreed to allow the plaintiff one half of the clear profits of the business, after deducting the necessary charges, and one of those charges was expressed to be a weekly salary to the plaintiff, which for the first year was not to exceed the sum of 2*l.* per week. In consideration of this the plaintiff agreed to devote all his time and attention to the concern. The business was accordingly carried on by the plaintiff and defendant until September, 1830. On the 6th of that month the plaintiff wrote a letter to the defendant, in which he informed him that he had taken such steps as would necessarily produce a separation; and after offering to do anything that he could to serve the defendant in his business, he required an investigation and a settlement of the accounts between them. This letter was delivered to the defendant about four o'clock in the afternoon, and, within an hour afterwards, the defendant went to the Liverpool police-office and asked for an officer to apprehend the plaintiff, who, he stated, was a clerk in his employment, and had embezzled some money which had been paid to him on defendant's account. A police-officer of the name of Halsall accordingly went to defendant's



house, and was there directed to a tavern in Cable-street, where plaintiff was dining in company with some friends. The police-officer apprehended plaintiff, and took him along Cable-street and Castle-street (which was described to be the most public street in Liverpool) to Bridewell, where the plaintiff remained during the night. On the following day the plaintiff was carried before a magistrate and remanded. It did not clearly appear on what account plaintiff was remanded, the police-officer stating it to have been at the request of defendant, in order to give him an opportunity of discovering whether any other charge could be found out against plaintiff, whilst another witness stated, that it was at the plaintiff's request for the purpose of enabling him to procure legal advice. The next day plaintiff was again taken before a magistrate, and a charge of embezzlement made against him by defendant. Plaintiff produced a copy of the agreement mentioned above, and the magistrate immediately dismissed the charge. These facts were proved by the police-officer who apprehended the plaintiff, and a friend who had accompanied him to Bridewell, and been present during the subsequent examination.—In cross-examination it was stated by both witnesses that the charge made by the defendant related to a small sum of money which defendant said had been paid by a person of the name of Sloman to plaintiff, on defendant's account. Plaintiff, when before the magistrate, did not deny that he had received the money; but alleged that he was a partner with defendant, and therefore had a right to receive it, and appropriate it, if he

pleased.—The Jury found for the plaintiff—Damages 100*l*.

8. RIOTS TO PREVENT SHIPMENTS OF CORN.—On the 8th a body of between fifty and sixty miners, chiefly from the parish of Newlyn, entered Newquay, where a vessel was taking in a cargo of barley, and insisted that the shipment should be discontinued. In consequence of their threats, some loads of grain that had been brought to the place were taken back. The nearest magistrates speedily repaired to Newquay, and swore a number of persons to act as special constables. This being done, they inquired of the miners, who still remained in a body, what their object was in thus attempting to prevent the free intercourse of trade between different parts of the kingdom.—They were informed that certain millers (who were named) had induced them to endeavour to prevent the shipment of the corn, by representing to them that they (the millers) found it impossible to obtain grain at any price, it being all bought up for exportation, and that unless this trade was stopped, an absolute famine in the country would ensue. The gentlemen proceeded to point out the absurdity of this statement, and the serious consequences of violating the law by the present proceedings. Finding the men were not disposed to attend to their exhortations to return to their homes, the magistrates read the Riot Act, when the miners took their departure, threatening to return the next day, in greater force. In consequence of these threats, the magistrates thought it necessary to send to Bodmin for a party of military, and twenty-five men accordingly proceeded to



Newquay. Next morning, about thirty of the Penhale men appeared on one of the heights near Newquay, but seeing that preparations had been made to resist any attempt they might make to prevent the loading of the vessel, they retired, and the vessel, having completed her cargo, sailed.

9. BURGLARY. — LINCOLN. — John Greenwood, mariner, was indicted for a burglary in the house of John Weatherhog, on the 9th of February last. The prisoner, it appeared, was married to the prosecutor's daughter upwards of a year before. About a month ago, he and his wife spent some time with her father, who is upwards of seventy years of age, and lives alone in a house a quarter of a mile distant from any other. On the night of the 9th of February, which was a few days after they had gone away, the prosecutor was sitting alone in his house, when, just as the fire was getting low, he heard a noise, and observed the window broken in by a piece of fir plank, and presently afterwards a man jumped in, and called out to the prosecutor that he would shoot him. He presented a pistol at his breast, and fired it so near as to set the prosecutor's clothes on fire, and burn a piece out of his jacket, flannel waistcoat, and shirt. The man then struck him with the pistol and knocked him down; and whilst he was down he struck him several times with the poker, with which he had previously raked out more of the fire to prevent any light from being emitted from it. He then made the prosecutor get up and show him where his money was, in all only 1*l.* 7*s.* 6*d.* in silver, which he took, and also his boxes, which he rifled of a silver spoon,

buckle, and some other articles, with which he decamped, having used a gruff tone of voice whenever he had spoken to the prosecutor, in consequence of which the latter never recognized him. Two constables, however, having gone in pursuit of him next morning, overtook him on the road to Hull, apprehended him and brought him back. He contrived, when passing over a bridge, to throw the bundle, which he carried, into a river, where it sunk; but there were found upon his person, the prosecutor's spoon, the buckle, and some shot, a slug, and a flint. There was no trace, however, about the person or clothes of the prosecutor of any shot or slugs having been discharged at him when the prisoner fired his pistol. — The Jury found him *Guilty*, and sentence of death was pronounced.

9. CONSPIRACY. — At the county Meath Assizes, Matthew Reilly and Christopher Courtney were indicted for a conspiracy against Miss Smith, a young lady of seventeen, of respectable family, and some fortune. They were charged with having conspired to inform against her as having written and sent certain threatening notices to her father Mr. Smith. They were signed "Rock and Strong," and were to the effect, that if Mr. Smith did not leave the country, he, and every bloody Brunswicker in his house, would meet their death. — Mr. Smith examined. He had returned from Dublin about the 2nd or 3rd of November. A day or two before he left town he received one of the notices, which was handed him by his coachman, Clifford, who came up to Dublin with it by the Drogheda coach. Knows the prisoners Reilly and



Courtney; Courtney was a common labourer; Reilly used to mow in the season. The morning after he returned home, he went to the stable to see his horses; Reilly came into the stable, and he said to him, "Reilly, what news?" Reilly said, "Bad news enough, have you not received a threatening notice?" Witness said, "Yes, a most diabolical one." Reilly said, "Then follow me to the barn and I will tell you something;" witness went to the barn, and found Courtney there. After following Reilly to the barn, witness said to him, "Reilly, tell me all about it, and I'll give you money, and make a man of you;" witness then went to Mrs. Smith for the notice, and brought it out; before he opened it, Reilly said, it had a cross on it, about that length (measuring it on his finger)—witness began to open out the notice, and before he had opened it, Reilly said, "That is not it;" When it was opened, and he saw the cross on the head of it, Reilly clapped his hands, and said, "That is it;" he then said, "It was a female wrote it." "Come," said witness, "tell me all about it; was it Anastatia O'Donoghue wrote it?" "No," said Reilly, "would to God it was." "Was it Miss Savoy?" "No, it was Miss Smith," said Reilly. [Here witness became overpowered and shed tears.] On the name of Miss Smith being mentioned, witness fell over against the wall. He said, "how could Miss Smith be employed in writing such diabolical notices?" Reilly then said, that he and Courtney were thrashing in the barn, that they overheated themselves, and that one had to go to the door, and the other to the spy-hole, to get air; and when he (Reilly) went to the spyhole, he

saw Miss Smith with a paper, and a red cross on it, held up before the window; he called to his comrade to come and see what Miss Smith was doing; the spyhole was about three feet from the ground; he called on Courtney to kneel down under him, until he would see her raise the cross; he said he thought the cross was spouting out blood at him. He (witness) then told Reilly, "he should hear more about this." Witness then went into the house, took a hurried breakfast, and brought Reilly into the parlour; Reilly made there a statement similar to what he made in the barn, and added the particulars as to the writing of the notice. He said Miss Smith, when she had finished writing the notice, put it into her right side pocket: Miss Smith replied, that she did not wear her pocket at the right side; Mrs. Smith and witness went into the barn, and sent Miss Savoy up to the window where Miss Smith used to draw; Miss Savoy held the notice in different positions, and in no way she could sit could they observe the cross on the paper, until she turned her right side, and then they could, with difficulty, observe the red cross. He (witness) is particularly sharp-sighted; brought Reilly to the spy-hole, and observed to him that it was almost impossible to see the cross. Reilly said, if the sun shone it could be better seen. This was about ten in the morning, there was then no sun shining. There were two doors to the barn, one looking into the kitchen-yard, and the other into the haggard; the door that looks into the haggard is the one that is kept open when the men are working. A map of the house and premises was then handed to Mr. Smith; he pointed out the



situation of the dwelling-house, barn, &c. Witness said, he then interrogated Reilly further, and from the agitation really manifested, he (Mr. Smith) clinched his fist at him, and swore, "By G—d, Reilly, you are a conspirator." About twelve o'clock after, he met Reilly and Courtney in the lawn; he asked them what made them quit their work; they said, they were going to Duleek, to clear themselves; witness said, they might go to the devil, that he (witness) would go to Duleek to have an investigation of it; witness then went to the head police-office in Dublin. Miss Smith is about seventeen or eighteen; she is not his only, but his eldest daughter. She was indisposed; her illness commenced about two years ago; she recovered, but relapsed again. Does not know how long she was ill altogether, but the physician could tell. The paper on which the notices were written had the Navan water-mark. The paper was produced; it bore C.M.D., as the water-mark.—Miss Smith remembered the threatening notices; the usual hours of going to rest were changed on account of these notices; she often stayed up till near morning; the first notice was found on the Sunday morning after the Christmas of 1829. Was then unable to leave her room; could not walk by herself; slept in the middle room; could not raise a window or walk to it. The second notice was left soon after the first; the fourth notice was served on a Sunday; she was at home; her father and mother were at church on that Sunday. About an hour after they went to church heard a noise; called to the housemaid, and bid her look out; she said she could see no person. About

half an hour after heard more noise; Anty went then into the next room. She begged of Anty to come and assist her to the window, to see what it was. Anty threw up the sash of the window, and witness saw a paper with a red direction on the green chair. Was about to withdraw, and saw a stout man, with a long frieze gray coat. She remained at the window, and when Anty returned, he went away. Anty went off by direction of the witness, leaving her at the window. Her father came home in half an hour afterwards; she sent for him; the paper was shown to her before papa came home, by her brother Henry's servant; her governess and mother are her religious instructors; she attended lectures in Dublin, and is aware of the obligation of an oath; swears positively she never saw the paper until it was shown to her on the green chair; she never wrote a word of it. (Another notice shown to her.) Saw it first at her father's house; they were sitting in the dining parlour on the evening it was found, and heard a gentle tap or noise at the window; heard further noise; a bell was rung; they were all a little surprised, but said nothing: Miss Savoy, two children, and the footman, were in the room; she heard a noise like a tap at the window; soon after she went out of the room; the notice was afterwards found; the two men at the bar have charged her with writing that notice; she never saw that paper until she saw it lying at the hall-door; Miss Savoy showed it to her; she never wrote a word of what is on that paper, and never drew or manufactured any of the notices left at her father's house; never wrote the catechism left at



her father's house.—Cross-examined. Miss Savoy and she were often left alone, and she felt a little solitary; if the family went to France or England, she would like to accompany them; Miss Savoy might have a similar taste; had no wish to leave home.—The Jury found the prisoners *Guilty*. Sentence, twelve months imprisonment, and each to be bound in his own recognizance for 100*l.*, and two sureties of 20*l.* to keep the peace for seven years.

9. MURDER.—Between eleven and twelve on the forenoon of Tuesday the 9th, an old woman, who, for several years had kept a small broker's shop in Bethnal Green, and who resided alone, though she had five children living, was found murdered in her own house. About that time, one of her sons happening to pass her house in company with a man named Robert Moxey, was surprised to find the door and shop closed, and the blinds of all the windows in front drawn down. He knocked at the door, and, receiving no answer, opened it; it was fastened only by an ordinary latch. On entering the shop he opened one of the windows, and perceived on different parts of the floor quantities of clotted blood. His feelings were so overcome that he could not proceed further, but Moxey did, and on entering a small kitchen apart from the shop, found the woman, with her skull beaten in in many places, (her person, and the floor about her covered with blood,) partly suspended by a piece of jack line from the latch of a door which led from the kitchen to a small yard attached to the house. The cord was made so tight about her neck, that he was obliged to cut it. In the kitchen was found, close to

where the body had been suspended, a heavy wooden roller, completely covered with blood; and on comparing it with the wounds on the head of the deceased, there could be no doubt but it was the weapon with which the murder was committed. On examining the rooms up stairs, all the drawers, presses, and cupboards were found to have been ransacked, two beds, also, had been taken away, together with the bed-clothes, and various other articles of property. From the deranged state of the deceased's dress, which was torn in many places, and the disordered state of the shop and kitchen, it was evident that she had made a desperate resistance. On the inquest, a surgeon, described two of the wounds in the head of the deceased as being most extensive and mortal. One of the small bones was forced into the brain, and he was of opinion that these wounds, as well as others, were inflicted by the wooden roller produced. He also gave it as his opinion that it was physically impossible that the deceased could have inflicted these injuries on herself, and that her death was produced by them. At first some suspicion, founded on alleged inconsistencies in his conduct, and falsehoods in his statements, attached to the son, who had discovered the murder; but the verdict of the Coroner's Jury was, "Wilful murder against some person or persons unknown." An indictment was afterwards found against the son, on which he was tried and acquitted.

10. MURDER. — LINCOLN. — Michael Lundy was charged with the murder of Thomas Swards. The prisoner was married to the daughter of the deceased; they were both Irish labourers. On



the morning of the 26th of July last, they hired themselves to a farmer named Wilson, who set them to work at heaping and burning weeds for manure. After their day's work was over, they had their supper, and Wilson proposed to them to sleep in his granary, observing, that, as he would lock them in, nobody could molest them. To this, however, the prisoner objected, as he had, he said, a pain in his stomach. Wilson then took them to his barn, furnished them with straw and sacks, and, putting the key in the inside of the door, told them they might lock themselves in or not, just as they pleased. It was with the prisoner he held conversation, the deceased not being able to speak English. There was a back door to the barn, which was fastened with a wooden bar inside. When Wilson went away, the prisoner was sitting on the grass outside the barn with this bar in his hands. About eight o'clock, Mrs. Wilson went to the yard to look after her poultry, and see that every thing was right. The barn-door was then open, and she observed the prisoner sitting on a form beside a bench on which a carpenter had been working there that day. The carpenter had left his tools in the barn, and amongst them was an axe, which lay on the ground. The barn was nearly half a mile distant from Wilson's dwelling-house. At about nine o'clock, Mrs. Wilson was alarmed by a cry of "murder." Her husband having gone up to the Castle, she called her son, and, as soon as he came down, opened the door, and saw the prisoner in his small-clothes and shirt, without shoes or stockings. He was screaming "murder," and seemed dreadfully frightened. He said the English-

man would murder him. In reply to questions put to him, he stated, that, as he was saying his prayers in the barn, a tall black man, six feet high, with a broad-brimmed glazed hat, made his appearance at the door, and waited until the prisoner had finished his prayers, when he asked him if he wanted company? to which the prisoner replied, he should be very glad of company. The man, who was an Englishman, then went in, and entered into conversation with the prisoner, and proposed to sleep with him. To this the prisoner objected, and on the man's pressing his proposal he became alarmed, pretended he was going to shut the door, bolted out of the barn, and ran towards the dwelling-house; but on his way he was pelted by somebody with stones, one of which struck him on the forehead. He was therefore sure that the Englishman meant to murder him. There was, in point of fact, a lump on his forehead, about the breadth of a shilling, but the skin was not broken. Mrs. Wilson asked him where his comrade was, and he replied that he was asleep in the corner of the barn; on which she reprimanded him for deserting him, if he thought he was in danger of being murdered. Young Wilson, and another man, then proposed to accompany him back to the barn, to which he instantly assented. A lantern was procured, and they all went to the barn, but found it locked, and could not find the key. Mrs. Wilson at length becoming fearful that there was something not right, sent her son for her husband, whom he met returning from the Castle. As soon as he was come, they again sought for the key, but not finding it, and receiving no answer to their calls and



knocks at the door, they broke open the back door of the barn. On going in, they found the deceased lying dead. The prisoner uttered a yell, and murmured something like a prayer, but did not approach any nearer to the body. On examining it, Wilson perceived the carpenter's axe buried in the face, near the mouth, and there was also a wound on the head, as if from the back of the axe. They then went to Elthorpe (including the prisoner), and brought a constable, and conveyed the body to Elthorpe. As soon as it was deposited there, the prisoner, who accompanied the rest of the party to Elthorpe a second time, but had neither assisted in drawing the cart, nor gone near the corpse, was taken into custody. A few sprinkles of blood, not larger than pin-heads, were observed on his corduroy small-clothes, and one drop on his bare leg. For the latter he accounted by saying, that a fly had bitten him, and for the former, by stating, that if he had any spots of blood on his clothes, he must have got them by endeavouring to put a stop to a row which had taken place between some of his countrymen on the preceding day (Sunday). His hands, which had been dirty when he was eating his supper, appeared to have been recently washed; and, on the constable asking him if he had washed his hands, he said he had not. On the following morning the print of a naked foot was found on the bank of a neighbouring pond, but, from the nature of the surrounding ground, it could be traced no farther. Six shillings and a knife were found in the prisoner's possession, and a halfpenny and a knife in the pocket of the deceased.

No indication had been observed of any animosity between the prisoner and the deceased, and the former was described as being, so far as he was known here, a man of peaceable and quiet demeanour.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*, and his Lordship pronounced sentence of death.

11. SALISBURY.—MURDER OF AN INFANT BY ITS FATHER.—Charles Giles, aged 22, was put to the bar, upon a charge of having, on the 18th of September last, feloniously caused the death of his own child, by administering to it a quantity of sulphuric acid.—Harriet Stone deposed, that she had “kept company” with the prisoner for a considerable time, and that the result of their intimacy was the birth of an illegitimate child, in September last. Some time before the child was born, the prisoner one day told the witness to stifle the child when it should be born. Soon after its birth, the child was brought to the prisoner, who said, “What is to be done with it now that it is alive?” And, in the same conversation, the prisoner said to the witness, “You may as well let me poison the child.” On a subsequent night, about a fortnight after, the prisoner came home about ten o'clock, and sent the witness out for change of a sovereign, the child remaining with the father alone. Whilst knocking at the door of the next house to get the change, witness heard the child make a noise, and, on returning, found the child in the prisoner's arms. On taking and kissing the child, witness perceived a heat upon its mouth. She said to the prisoner, “Oh, my God, Charles, you have poisoned my child.” He denied it. The prisoner then stepped out through a



window, taking the child with him. He soon returned, and gave the child to the witness, after which the prisoner and the witness left the house. Having gone some distance, the witness put her finger into the child's throat, and found it hot and parched. She said she thought it was dying, and gave it to the prisoner. The child died soon after. Witness asked the prisoner what he would do with it, and he said that he should bury it with his brother. He wrapped it in a pillow-case, and put it in the pocket of his smock frock, and said that the witness must not tell any thing about it. Witness afterwards disclosed the circumstances to her sister, by whose advice she went to a magistrate. — Two surgeons deposed, that, on dissecting the infant's body, and applying the test of barytes to the contents of the stomach, they found them to consist in a large proportion of sulphuric acid.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*.

A similar case was tried, on the 11th, at Lancaster, where Moses Fernely was indicted for the murder of his step-son, scarcely five years old. — Mary Ann Sparks examined ; I took care of the child, which lived with the prisoner. The evening before its death, he told me to come early the next morning, as he wanted to go early to work. I went at a quarter, or half-past six. His wife had gone out. When I first entered the house, he was coming out of the room where the children slept. Soon after, he had breakfast, and then again went into the children's room. After he had been absent about a minute, he returned, and said, " Mary Ann, little Johnny is very ill." I heard the child moan, and say, " Father, my throat

is sore." He went in a second time, about half an hour after, and then brought out the child and laid it on a table. I saw some black stuff come out of the child's mouth. It was sick, and I wanted to give it some water, but prisoner objected, and said it would do more harm than good. Prisoner did not send me for a doctor ; Jane Barrett did about half-past eleven. When I got back, the child was dying. After it was dead, he sent me for the mother. — Cross-examined. When prisoner saw the deceased in pain, he seemed a good deal distressed, and began to cry. He did not go to his work, but remained at home all day, offering assistance to the child.—Jane Barrett. I live next door to prisoner. On the day the child died, I went to prisoner's house about nine o'clock. The deceased was on a table, with a blanket thrown over him, and prisoner was sitting by on a stool. Some stuff was frothing out of its mouth, and its tongue was hanging out. It asked for water, and I got some and gave it. The child could not swallow ; the water ran out at its nose. Prisoner said, he thought the child had a quincy in the throat. A little after twelve the prisoner came to my house. He seemed quite cheerful, and said, " Jane, come in and look at it now." I went in ; the child's tongue was hanging out of its mouth, the mouth was drawn on one side, and so was one of the eyes. I perceived the child die. I told him it was dead. He became very pale, and said, " If I had known thou would'st die, I would not have used thee so cruelly." He told me to wash the child, and I did so. I then sent for the mother : after she came, she took a cup off the shelf to get some coffee in. The prisoner said, " If



you will have coffee, you must wash that cup out, it has had Johnny's stuff in."—John Drinkwater. On the 8th of November, I was confined in the New Bailey, at Manchester, for an assault. On Tuesday, the 9th of November, the prisoner was brought from the Lock-up-house to the New Bailey. I said to him, "Well, my man, what's your crime?" He said, "A d—n sight worse than yours." I asked, "What is it?" He said, "Wilful murder, if they can prove it; but they cannot prove it, as they did not see me do it." He said, "The doctors say he was poisoned, but it was not poison, it was oil of vitriol." He said they could not prove it against him, for they could not find the remainder of the stuff. He added, "I took care to finish the b——r. I throttled him, and kicked him with my shoes." I told him to keep his own counsel, but he said, he did not care a d—n, they could not prove it. During this conversation, a man of the name of Condon, and two or three other men, were by. The others heard this conversation.—James Condon corroborated the statement of the last witness.—On cross-examination, witness said, that there were several persons present, all of whom heard the conversation. Witness thought so little about it, that he did not stay to hear the whole of it, but, feeling sleepy, went to lie down.—The medical men who had examined the body, proved clearly that the death had been caused by oil of vitriol.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*, and the prisoner was ordered for execution.

11. KING'S EVIDENCE.—At Lancaster, on the 11th of March; Thomas Fulvey was indicted for the murder of Charles Burn, and his brother John Fulvey, as being

a principal, in the second degree, by being present, aiding and abetting in the perpetration of the murder. The principal witness against them, was a third brother, Michael Fulvey. It appeared from the evidence, that the deceased was a merchant at Liverpool, whose place of residence was two or three miles out of the town, and that he was in the habit of going home every evening. On the night of the 9th of October last, about a quarter before eight, the deceased knocked at the door of a Mr. Turton, who lives at Everton, about six yards from the West Derby road, along which the deceased would pass on his way to his own house. Deceased appeared to be much alarmed, and blood was flowing from his body. He said he had been attacked and wounded, and desired his wife to be sent for. He wished Mrs. Turton to put her hand to his side, and she did so, and could distinctly perceive a ball. Deceased said, "If any thing happens to me before Mrs. Burn arrives, tell her I thought of her and of the children." Mr. Blackburn, a surgeon of Liverpool, arrived in a short time, and accompanied deceased to his own house, where he died in twenty-four hours after. The wound made by the bullet was the cause of his death. Nothing transpired to point a suspicion against any one until a few days ago, when Michael Fulvey, who, with the two prisoners, was confined in Lancaster Castle, under a charge of committing several highway robberies, gave information which led to an indictment being preferred for the murder against the two prisoners. Michael was admitted King's evidence, and now came forward as a witness



against his brothers. He stated he was a tailor residing in Naylor-court, Naylor-street, Liverpool, and that his two brothers on the night of 9th of October last, went out in company with him about two miles on the West Derby road. Their intention was to rob; and the prisoner Thomas carried a horse-pistol, which he had purchased a few days before. On getting about two miles from witness's residence, they overtook a man, and desired him to stop. He began to run, and the prisoner John Fulvey said, "if he runs, shoot him." The prisoner Thomas immediately discharged the pistol, but the man got away. The witness was then examined as to several points on which the prosecutors proposed to offer evidence to confirm him. He stated, that a little before a man on horseback had passed them, and a servant of Mr. Hollinshed swore that on that evening he had on horseback passed three men in the situation, and about the time, mentioned by Michael Fulvey. Witness also stated that some time after the pistol had been fired, a carriage passed, which they observed to stop, and the steps of which were let down either to let some one in or out. This was confirmed by Mr. Blackburn, the surgeon, who stated that, on conveying the deceased home in a carriage, they met a gentleman and lady, friends of the deceased, and the carriage stopped, and the steps were let down for the purpose of admitting the lady. Witness stated also, that subsequently, on the same evening, they attacked another person, whom they robbed (among other things) of a silver pencil-case. It was proved by a Mr. Arrowsmith, that on the night in

question he had been attacked on the West Derby road, and robbed, and that a silver pencil-case had been taken from him. That pencil-case was proved to have been offered in pledge by the prisoner, Thomas Fulvey, on the following Thursday, to a pawnbroker in Liverpool, who, upon seeing the name of Arrowsmith upon it, detained it, and caused the apprehension of prisoner and witness.

On cross-examination many facts were elicited, to show that the character of the witness was of the worst description. He admitted that he was under indictment for a number of offences, and that he expected to save himself by the conviction of his brothers. This was not the first time he had been a witness. He had given evidence in Ireland against a man who had sold him some stolen goods. He had also, on another occasion, turned approver against nine men, with whom he had been concerned. He admitted being engaged in attacking the house of a priest of the name of Hacketts, where he had got wounded.—The Jury returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*.

12. MURDER.—LANCASTER.—Ashton Worrall, *aged* 25; William Worrall, 38; and Robert Chadder-ton, 22; were indicted for the wilful murder of Sarah M'Chrinin, at Failsworth, on the 22nd of December.

The deceased, who was upwards of sixty-four years of age, was the wife of a labouring man residing at Bolton. On the morning of the 22nd of December last, she left Bolton for the purpose of going to Oldham, to visit a daughter who lived there. Before she left Bolton, she borrowed from a neighbour a cloak, a gown, a bonnet, and a pair of stockings. She pro-



ceeded to Manchester, which is about twelve miles from Bolton, and six from Oldham. A woman, whose description answered that of the deceased, was seen between eight and nine o'clock that evening, about two miles from Manchester, on the Oldham road. The watchman observed her go off the causeway, and he went and spoke to her. She said that she was light-headed, and had undertaken too long a journey for a woman of her years. Whilst they were talking together, another witness of the name of Lees went past, on his way home from Manchester. The woman accosted him, and requested permission to walk with him as far as he went. He gave it, and they went on together for about a mile and a half. The woman appeared to be faint, and was sometimes obliged to run, in order to keep up with him. He left her near the canal bridge, on the Manchester and Oldham road. The next witness, a Mrs. Moor, stated, that, on the evening in question, between nine and ten o'clock, the deceased called at her house, which is on the Oldham road, about half a mile from the place where the last witness and his companion had parted, and asked for some water to drink. On the following day a land-surveyor, of the name of Schofield, was measuring some fields adjoining the road leading from Manchester to Oldham,—nearer to Oldham than the house of last witness,—when he found the body of the deceased, in a place called "The Street," which, having been formerly part of a Roman road, is called by that name, although it forms no part of a regular road. To reach that place she must have left the direct road to Oldham, and crossed one

or two fields. Her body was lying in a ditch, exposed from the waist downwards. Her bonnet and cap were off, the former lying near her feet. A little blood was perceived on her mouth, and a scratch upon her knee; but there was no other mark of violence. The body was removed to the adjoining village of Newton, and there minutely examined by a surgeon. Extravasated blood was found upon the brain, and as the surgeon did not hear that any violence had been suffered; it appeared to him that the deceased had died of apoplexy, and he gave an opinion to that effect. A verdict of accidental death was accordingly returned by the coroner's inquest, and no further inquiry took place at that time. A few days afterwards, however, circumstances transpired which led to the apprehension of two young men of the names of Ashton Hulton, and William Mellor, and in the house of the latter a cloak was found, which was clearly proved to be the cloak which the deceased had worn when she quitted Bolton. Upon their examination before the magistrates, they made a statement which caused the prisoners to be taken into custody. Hulton now stated, that, on the night of the 22nd of December, he was present with the two Worralls, and several other persons at a public-house, situated on the road from Manchester to Oldham, and a little nearer to Oldham than the house of Mrs. Moor, where the deceased had last been seen. Witness and the two Worralls left the public-house about half-past nine o'clock in the evening, and crossed over the fields leading to "The Street," in the direction of Ashton Worrall's house, to which they were going.



When they got to the hedge which separates the field from "The Street," witness had occasion to stop for a short time, whilst the prisoners Ashton Worrall and Thomas Chadderton proceeded. During this time witness heard a female voice say "Oh, dear me, this will never do," and immediately after heard a cry of "Murder." He then got over the hedge into "The Street," and saw that the two Worralls had been joined by a third man who had not been in their company before. That man witness thought was the prisoner Chadderton, whom he well knew; but although he afterwards remained some time in the man's company, he never saw his face, and his opinion, therefore, was only formed from the voice and dress. He would not venture to swear that Chadderton was the man. Witness then stated, that he saw the two Worralls and the other man throw the woman down, and then two of them held the woman down, with her arms extended apart, whilst the third committed brutal violence on her person. This was repeated by each of the three, the other two in the same manner keeping down the arms of the woman. In the end, witness stated, the woman was motionless, and the three men took her and threw her into a ditch between "The Street," and the hedge. They then went together as far as the Ashton Canal, when a man passed by. Ashton Worrall, who appeared to have something concealed under his coat, went up to the man, and witness distinctly heard him say, "Here, take this, and say nothing about it." On cross-examination, the witness said that he would gladly have given the woman assistance if he had

been able. He admitted that he had not said a word about the transaction until he was taken into custody, but accounted for that by saying that he was afraid of the prisoners. He admitted also, that in the first instance he had given a very different account, saying, that, after he and the Worralls had left the public-house, they had gone directly to Ashton Worrall's house, and had seen no woman at all in their way. This he also accounted for, by saying that he was afraid of Ashton Worrall. He was cross-examined also as to some observation which he had made to Mellor, and Mellor to him, when going before the magistrate, but he firmly denied that any remark had passed between them on the subject.

William Mellor swore, that, on the night in question, between ten and eleven o'clock he was passing near the Ashton canal when he saw some men. One of them, whom he believed to be Ashton Worrall, gave him a cloak, telling him to take it and say nothing about it. He took it home, and it ultimately turned out to be the cloak of the deceased. A man of the name of Berry, an assistant of Mr. Schofield shortly after the body was found saw Ashton Worrall about a field's length from the place where the body was lying. Ashton said, "Where is she?" and witness pointed to the spot. Ashton said, "D—n it, I wish I had never had any thing to do with her." Evidence was also given to show that, about the hour mentioned by the witness Hulton, cries of murder had been heard about the spot in which he described the scene to have happened, and that the two Worralls had been seen in the neighbourhood about that time. A shirt button



was found lying near the deceased, and upon examining Chadderton's shirt, a button appeared to be wanting; but great numbers of persons had been near the place. Mr. Thornley, the surgeon, who had first examined the deceased, was then called—he stated, that in the first instance, not knowing any thing of the violence which appeared to have been offered, he had been of opinion that the death of the deceased had been occasioned by apoplexy, and had said that he believed she died a natural death. After hearing the evidence, he was decidedly of opinion that she had died of apoplexy occasioned by violence.—Mr. Davies, a surgeon of great experience, stated, that he had heard the evidence of all the witnesses, and in his judgment, the deceased had died of apoplexy, occasioned by the violence to which she had been subjected.

The prisoners, in their defence, all alleged their innocence. The two Worralls stated, that they had gone home from the Sun Inn; had reached their home about ten o'clock, and never gone out afterwards. The witnesses for Chadderton established a satisfactory *alibi*.

The Jury, without leaving the box, returned a verdict of *Guilty* against Ashton Worrall and William Worrall, and found Robert Chadderton *Not Guilty*.

The Judge then passed sentence of death, and directed the two prisoners who had been convicted to be executed on the following Monday.

25. DEAF AND DUMB. YORK.—Esther Dyson was indicted for the wilful Murder of her infant child, by cutting off its head with a knife. The prisoner, upon being arraigned and required to plead,

made no reply, and the Jury was sworn to try whether she stood mute of malice, or by the visitation of God. A witness, of the name of Henderson, deposed, that he had known the prisoner from infancy, and that she had always been deaf and dumb. On this evidence, the Jury found, that the prisoner stood mute through the visitation of God. The same witness was then sworn to interpret the questions put to the prisoner, and her answers, which he did by certain signs with which the prisoner was familiar. The prisoner, after some time, signified that she had not committed the act with which she was charged, and a plea of "Not Guilty" was recorded. The Jury were then desired to stand up to be sworn, when another difficulty presented itself. There was no mode of making the prisoner comprehend that she had a right to challenge the Jury. A variety of questions were put, at the suggestion of the counsel for the prosecution; but though she answered by signs, that she knew she had been brought to York for what she was supposed to have done, it was found impossible to make her understand the purpose for which she had then been brought into court, and the nature of a trial by jury. Another witness, a Mrs. Briggs, was then sworn, but her efforts were as fruitless as those of the first interpreter; and both the witnesses agreed that they could not make the prisoner understand the nature and purpose of things which she had not witnessed before. Under these circumstances, Mr. Justice Parke stopped the proceedings, until he conferred with Mr. Justice Littledale. The learned Judge was absent from court a short time, and



on his return directed a Jury to be empanelled, to try whether the prisoner was then in such a state of mind as to be capable of understanding the proceedings which were then going on. The two interpreters were again sworn, and put a variety of questions with no better success. The Jury found, that the prisoner was not at that moment in a sane state of mind. The prisoner was then remanded.

28. ILLUMINATION RIOTS.—On the 28th, an illumination took place at Edinburgh, to celebrate the triumph of the Reform Bill, having been carried through a second reading by a majority of one. Many of the best friends of the measure were of opinion, that any demonstration of joy by illumination was uncalled for and premature, while the anti-reformers were naturally averse to an expression of satisfaction under any circumstances. There was, in consequence, considerable hesitation and doubt, and in the forenoon the magistrates had a printed notice, judiciously advising the inhabitants to defer any illumination until the passing of the Bill. But this notice was not issued. In the meantime, many among the more zealous friends of the measure were still determined to illuminate, and began to make preparations by cleaning their windows, &c. ; and in consequence, a notice was issued in the afternoon from the sheriff and magistrates, intimating to the inhabitants, that, as a great number had determined to illuminate, it would be advisable, in order to preserve the peace of the city, that the illumination should be general. Many of the inhabitants were not inclined to concur in any marked expression of joy ; and they were much perplexed by the vacillating

resolutions of the magistrates ; accordingly many houses in the New Town were not lighted. In the Old Town there was a greater appearance of preparation and of spontaneous zeal ; all the humblest dwellings were fully lighted up. Very early in the evening the mob began to manifest symptoms of riot ; and a crowd of blackguards collected, who were intent on mischief, and determined, as usual, to wreak their vengeance on the non-illuminated houses. Having collected stones at the Calton-hill, they entered the Canongate, and broke the windows of every unilluminated house as they passed along. They afterwards received a large accession of boys and lads, a great proportion consisting of bakers, glaziers, and others of the working-classes, and proceeded along the principal streets of the New Town, Heriot Row, Moray Place, and all the fine streets adjoining, namely Melville Street, Athol Crescent, Shandwick Place, and Charlotte Square, pouring volleys of stones into every house that was not lighted, into many warehouses, into houses, many of them untenanted, though they were protected by torch-bearers, from whom they wrested their torches, and bore them about the streets openly, and in triumph. Another band collected between nine and ten o'clock at the Royal Institution, the windows of which they destroyed, and proceeded with loud shouts along Hanover Street, George Street, St. Andrew's Square, Queen Street, Duke Street, and Abercromby Place, breaking the windows as they went along ; and, contrary to all former precedent, attacking the torch-bearers who stood as a pro-



tection before many houses. In several instances the windows of houses that were illuminated were broken. One gentleman had put himself to great expense in producing a splendid star, composed of variegated lamps, with which he adorned the front of his house; and, in order to give it full effect, he refrained from putting candles in his windows. On came the rabble, with their piper and torches. The windows were not lighted! This was enough; and in ten seconds all went to wreck, star, windows — every thing within their reach. Several shops that were shut had the glass above the doors smashed to pieces; and in many houses which had been lighted, and in which the lights had been extinguished sooner than was thought proper by the mob, the windows were all broken. The dilapidated state of numerous elegant mansions throughout the New Town, on Tuesday morning, bore testimony to the outrages of the previous night.

On the same day, still more riotous scenes took place at Dundee. On Sunday the 27th, some unknown individuals ordered an illumination, by placards, in the following terms:—

“The boroughmongers are defeated and condemned, in spite of their own interested votes!! The speedy and final triumph of Reform is certain!!! Let all Dundee be illuminated on the night of Monday first, from seven till nine o’clock. There is to be an illumination in Edinburgh on that night.”

Every one inquired, who has ordered the illumination?—who has published the placards? And almost all concurred in denouncing it as an impudent trick. The

Justices on Monday found it was too late to forbid the illumination, and accordingly issued a hand-bill, stating that they had received a requisition to have the town illuminated, and that an illumination would take place. The illumination was general; people preferring to be at the expense of a few candles rather than have their property destroyed. Boats, tar-barrels, &c., were passed along the streets and burned; several windows which were not lighted up were broken. Towards midnight the chief disturbances were confined to the High Street, where an immense crowd was collected, and a bonfire made out of the remains of a boat, a number of tar-barrels, and other combustibles. About half-past eleven the Police Commissioners, observing that the crowd shewed no disposition to disperse, and that the fire was industriously fed from all quarters, and the burning faggots occasionally thrown about in all directions, interfered, in order to prevent the fire from being kept up, and, after telling the crowd that they had allowed them hitherto every liberty, exhorted them to forbear from throwing on more fuel, and to go home quietly. For this purpose the pensioner-constables and police-officers formed a circle round the fire for about half an hour. The more daring of the crowd not relishing this, made an attempt to push the constables into the fire, which they resisted, and cleared away the crowd in that direction with their batons. Stones and other missiles were collected and thrown at the Commissioners; but the fire was put out, and part of the remains taken away, although the policemen engaged in this duty were very rough-



ly handled by the mob. About half-past twelve the crowd had removed to the entrance of the Police Office, where the contest continued for some hours; the constables then dispersed, leaving the police-officers to manage as they best could. The latter retired into the lane leading to the office, and occasionally burst out and secured the most active among the crowd; they were, however, few in number when compared with their assailants, and they were at times beaten back, and the windows of the office were smashed to pieces. About forty of the rioters were apprehended and lodged in the Police Office, and repeated attempts were made to force it and rescue the prisoners. Next day (29th) crowds collected in various parts of the town, and the detention of the prisoners in the Police Office was a general subject of conversation. In the evening, an attack was made on the office (which is situated behind the Town House), and the door was forced, an old lamp-iron being used as a battering ram. The mob having effected an entrance, the prisoners were set at liberty; but not satisfied with this achievement, they proceeded to gut the office, and every form, book, lantern, or other article that could be lifted or torn up, was carried to the street and burned. A great number of the windows of the Town House were broken during the riot.

30. RAILWAYS A NUISANCE. YORK.—*Rex v. Pearse and others*,—This was an indictment for a nuisance, against the directors of the Stockton and Darlington Railway Company.—By an act of Parliament, passed in 1821, the defendants were authorized to form a railway from Darlington to Sun-

derland, and by another act, passed in 1823, they were authorized to use locomotive engines thereon. The rail-way, which it was agreed had been formed upon the line pointed out in the act of Parliament, was opened for public use in 1825. Only one steam-carriage was at first used; but the number gradually increased; till there were seven steam-carriages in operation. The increase had been rendered necessary by the increased and increasing business on the rail-way. For about a mile and three-quarters the rail-way runs in a parallel line with the high road leading from Yarm to Stockton, the two roads being at an average distance of fifty yards from each other. The nuisance complained of was, the fright and danger which the noise and the smoke of the steam-engines occasioned to passengers on this part of the high-way. A variety of witnesses proved, that accidents frequently happened in consequence of horses taking fright at the steam-engines. Mr. Pollock stated, that he was willing to admit that the defendants had been guilty of a nuisance, unless their conduct was justified by the act of Parliament, according to the directions of which the rail-way had been formed, and the steam-carriages used. He suggested, therefore, that the best mode would be for the Jury to return a special verdict, finding the facts already proved, and, also, that the defendants had used the best engines they could procure, and availed themselves of every improvement that had been offered.—Mr. Williams, for the prosecution, after some deliberation, agreed to the proposal, and a verdict of *Guilty* was accordingly entered.



## 31. RELIGIOUS MADNESS. —

TAUNTON.—Thomas Searle was charged with having cut and wounded his daughter, Elizabeth Searle, with intent to murder her. It appeared that the prisoner had been in a state of religious madness, in consequence, as he alleged, of a sermon which had been preached at the parish church of Thorn, by a Mr. Watts, every word of which he thought to have been addressed to himself. He became impressed with the conviction that he had committed the sin against the Holy Ghost, and that therefore he could never obtain forgiveness either in this world or the next; and for months before the commission of the offence he kept his family in a continual state of apprehension for his personal safety. On the 25th of September last he took his daughter, a child only twelve years old, up stairs in his house, and asked her if she would wish to go to Heaven; and, upon the child saying yes, the father kissed her affectionately, after which he cut her throat to a considerable extent, under the ear, in the muscular part, and inflicted other wounds upon other parts of her body. Another of his daughters, nine years old, hearing the cries of her sister, ran to the room, and in attempting to seize the knife, was wounded in the hand. It seemed, however, that the attempt to commit so enormous a crime had, in some degree, awakened the unhappy parent from the delusion under which he had laboured, and in consequence of which he believed that he had been commanded to kill his daughter by the express direction of the Holy Ghost. Some persons came to the assistance of the child, and, on remonstrating with the father,

he expressed the greatest horror at the attempt which he had made. The child, who was now called as a witness, stated some of the above-mentioned facts. When her examination had been concluded, the prisoner, who had no counsel, was asked by the Judge, if he had any questions to ask of the witness? The putting of the question induced the little girl to look round, and her eyes no sooner had fallen upon her father, whom she had not previously seen, than she burst into tears and instantly fainted away. Another of the prisoner's daughters deposed to some facts tending to show the prisoner's insanity at the time of committing the act. She said that he was the most affectionate of husbands and of parents, and had always been peculiarly fond of the child whom he attempted to kill.

The Jury *acquitted* the prisoner upon the ground of his being insane at the time of committing the act.

## DISCOVERY OF MURDER. —

About a month ago there appeared a paragraph in the Stamford Champion and the News, stating that "an old woman named Levison, who lately died at Braunston, near Oakham, made confession on her death-bed to the minister, that she, along with her then master, one Smith, had been concerned in the murder of a beast-jobber, a stranger, who had come to her master's residence to receive money; that she held his head, while Smith beat out his brains with a coal-hammer." Mr. W. Hinds, late a schoolmaster, of Boston, having nearly thirty years before, lost a cousin, named Samuel Johnson, who disappeared in a mysterious manner, on seeing the above paragraph, immediately wrote to the



minister of Braunston for further information relative to the murder. The result was, that Mr. Hinds ascertained that the person thus murdered was the identical beast-jobber, Johnson, who left Freiston about Christmas 1801, with considerable property, and a quantity of cattle to sell at Smithfield-market, which it appears he sold. On his return he called at Oakham to meet Smith and a man named Hackett, to receive money for beasts sold to them at the preceding Lammas. Hackett settled with him, but Smith failed to come, and in consequence Johnson went to Smith's house for the money, and was never more seen. Smith and the woman lately dead—whose name the minister says is Levi—robbed and murdered him, and buried his body in the stack-yard. Smith, who had previously been in indifferent circumstances, launched out into business for some years, but after a time he failed and died a pauper, and was buried at the expense of the parish in 1825. He used annually to erect haystacks upon the place where he had buried his victim. After he left the place about twelve years ago, some men, who were digging for gravel, found the bones of Johnson, and they were collected and interred in Knossington church-yard. Johnson was supposed to have had about him property to the amount of 1,600*l.* or 1,800*l.* Two letters, purporting to be written by the deceased, but which at the time were generally believed to be forgeries, were received by his friends at Freiston, stating that he had hired himself to a butcher at Epping. They are supposed to have been written by the murderer for the purpose of diverting the attention of the deceased's friends.

## APRIL.

6. FIRE.—Early in the morning a fire broke out in the house of Mr. Stewart, baker, Sermon-lane, Doctors' Commons. In a few minutes after the alarm was given, the whole house was in a blaze. The family and lodgers had no possibility of escape by the street-door, as the flames and smoke ascended to the upper part of the house. Some of them, however, escaped in their night-clothes by the top of the house, while others threw themselves out of the first floor windows, in almost a state of nudity, into the street. They were, however, caught by a party of the city-police, who broke their fall, though not without personal injury to a female whose leg and knee were seriously hurt. The fire in a little time communicated to the house of Mr. Lee, corn-chandler, No. 17, Sermon-lane, at the corner of Carter-lane, and thence to the houses of Mr. Sauze, stationer, and Mr. Bouker, boot and shoe-maker, in Carter-lane, and that of Mr. Gray, in Knowles-court, Sermon-lane, all of which were burning at the same time. The speedy arrival of the engines, with the activity of the firemen and a plentiful supply of water, was the means of preserving the whole of a densely inhabited neighbourhood from total destruction. The loss of property was very great; the houses and goods of Mr. Stewart and Mr. Lee, and the property of Mr. Sauze, as well as that of the Misses Bennett, milliners and dress-makers, who occupied the upper part of his house, and of Mr. Bouker, being completely destroyed, and several houses in Sermon-lane, op-



posite to the seat of the fire, very much scorched.

**FOURTEEN PERSONS DROWNED.**—On Friday, as six men and eight women were proceeding in a boat on Lough Allen to their homes, from the market of Drumshambo, they were overtaken by a heavy squall of wind, when within two miles of the canal. The women becoming frightened rushed to the side of the boat which they considered to be safest. The effect was, that the boat upset, and every soul on board perished! The boat was heavily laden, having a quantity of potatoes and meal, with other articles on board, which the unfortunate sufferers had purchased for the use of their families. The sufferers were all from the neighbourhood of Drumkeerin, in the county of Leitrim. Eleven of them left large and helpless families.—*Dublin Freeman's Journal*.

**14. SINGULAR ACCIDENT.**—*Croft Head Print Works.*—Robert Martin, millwright, having occasion to be oiling an iron shaft which was in motion, and was about ten feet from the ground, a small hook attached to it got entangled in the button-hole of his jacket, and in a moment suspended him from the steps he was resting on, carrying him round about in regular motion, and giving a heavy fall as often as he came undermost. Still the hold did not give way; and finding all attempts to shake himself clear unavailing, Martin, with great presence of mind, and after a violent effort, succeeded in getting his legs and arms firmly clasped round the shaft: thus he was stretched out at full length, and turned round in regular succession with it, but in a comparatively easier position than the first. A little boy, who was on the spot, at

first laughed out most heartily, thinking that the millwright was trying some mountebank trick; but when some time had elapsed, and he could get no answer from Martin, he began to weep, and went in search of assistance. The water-wheel was immediately stopped, and soon after Martin was found still clinging to the shaft, and in such an exhausted state, that he could not have kept his hold much longer. He was conveyed home, and it was ascertained that two of his ribs were broken, but was soon considered by his medical attendant out of all danger. Martin calculates that he was nearly an hour turning round with the shaft, which is about four inches in diameter; nor could he ever speak a word distinctly, though he often tried to tell the boy, to bring somebody. He was very dizzy for the first ten minutes, but after shutting his eyes, the dizziness gradually left him.

**16. ERRONEOUS VERDICT.**—At the Old Bailey Sessions, a man named Ellis was tried, along with three others, for breaking into and robbing the house of an eminent tailor. He was found guilty, and ordered for execution on Tuesday the 19th. He had been convicted on proof of the recent possession of the goods alone. The Sheriffs having received certain intelligence concerning the convict, proceeded to examine witnesses, and investigate the case in every particular, and they ascertained beyond a doubt, that although he had been marked as a receiver of stolen goods for the last two years, he had never been known or supposed to be a house-breaker. Fifteen or sixteen witnesses were examined, and from their evidence it appeared that he



had committed the minor offence merely. It was proved, both from positive and from circumstantial testimony, that he knew nothing of the robbery until after it had been perpetrated,—that four young men went to his house on the morning after the robbery, and invited him to a house in the Seven-dials, to see the goods,—that he there bargained for them,—that Francis Coy, who had been convicted along with him, but whose sentence was commuted, and a young man not in custody, were of the party, and sent by him with the money for the goods, which they measured, and accordingly paid for,—and that Coy then went, by his direction, to sell the goods to a piece-broker, on whose premises the property was found. When the order for the execution came down, the inquiry was followed up with zeal by the Sheriffs, and, fortunately, the person who gave the information to the officers was discovered, and he confirmed the evidence adduced of the part which Ellis had taken in the transaction. Upon application to the magistrates and officers at Marlborough-street, the statement of the informant was corroborated as to its exact agreement with what he had communicated to them. Seventeen affidavits and statements were prepared and laid, on Saturday morning, before Lord Melbourne, who entered immediately into the investigation. Copies of all the documents were also sent off by express to the Lord Chancellor, who had not attended at the Council; and on Saturday evening a respite during pleasure was received for Ellis at Newgate.

26. DEATH FROM STAYS.—An inquest was held at Stepney, on view of the body of Miss Betsy

Harris, a young woman, twenty-two years of age.—Mr. Richard Pater, surgeon, stated that, on Sunday evening last, he was sent for to attend the deceased. On going to her mother's house, he found her lying on the carpet in the back parlour. She was then quite dead, but the body was not cold. For the satisfaction of her friends, he opened a vein in the arm, but only a few drops of blood followed the incision. On that morning he opened the body and head of the deceased, and found the brain in a state of congestion. This, he imagined, was produced by compression on the descending aorta from a very hearty meal, and great pressure from the stays of the deceased, which, at the time of her death, was really incredible. The effect of the pressure was, that the blood was prevented from passing in its ordinary course to the lower extremities, and consequently caused a greater flow of it to the lungs and brain. The heart, the lungs, the stomach, and intestines, were perfectly healthy, but the two latter were considerably distended with fluids and food. There was an excessive quantity of roast beef and spinach in the stomach, which appeared to have been but recently taken. He was of opinion that the congestion of blood on the brain, which she was predisposed to from her make, and which was occasioned by the pressure he had before described, produced apoplexy, which was the cause of the death of the deceased.—Mrs. Rogers, a neighbour, deposed, that, about half-past eight o'clock on Sunday evening, she was called in to see the deceased. Deceased lay apparently lifeless. She (witness) assisted in unloosing her clothes, which were extremely



tight round the body. Her stays were laced so tight, as in witness's opinion, to cause a very unhealthy and improper pressure. Indeed, she did not know how the deceased could have borne them on, and was not surprised at their having occasioned her death. The deceased lived with her mother and sister, and, as far as witness was able to judge, they lived on the most friendly and affectionate terms with each other. Witness saw the deceased on Sunday morning, when she appeared in perfect health.—Mrs. Anne Maria Wood, sister to the deceased, said, that she was at the house of her mother on Sunday evening, when the deceased died. Throughout the day she was in excellent health and spirits, and ate a hearty dinner about one o'clock. She made no complaint of illness during the evening, but merely once or twice said that she felt rather sleepy. About eight o'clock the deceased was standing with her mother at the front door, admiring the beauties of the moon, when, all at once, she fell back in the hall, exclaiming, "Oh! mamma," and never spoke more.—The Jury, without hesitation, returned a verdict, "that the deceased died of apoplexy, produced by her stays being too tightly laced."

27. DEATHS BY FIRE.—Early in the morning, a fire broke out in the house of Lord Walsingham, Upper Harley-street, Cavendish-square. As soon as the servants were alarmed, they hastened to lord Walsingham's bed-room, but found it a mass of flame and smoke, through which they could not make their way. Lady Walsingham, who slept in another room on the same floor, having been roused, attempted to escape by leaping out

of the window into a back yard, where she was soon after found lying, with her arms and both thighs broken. She died a few hours afterwards. She would have escaped, if, instead of leaping from the window, she had opened her door, and gone down stairs with the servants who gave her the alarm.

As soon as the flames were partially subdued, the drawing-room and lower part of the house having remained comparatively uninjured, the remains of lord Walsingham were found in a state of almost entire destruction; the extremities, hands and feet, were literally consumed to ashes, and the head and skeleton of the body alone presented any thing like an appearance of humanity. The remains were removed to the stable in which the mangled body of lady Walsingham lay, and there the coroner's inquest was held. From the fire having broken out in his lordship's sleeping-room, shortly after he had retired to rest, it was conjectured he had left the taper lighted by the bed side, and fallen asleep without extinguishing it.

Mary Rolfe stated, she was lady's-maid to the deceased, and was with her ladyship on Tuesday night, about ten o'clock, when her ladyship retired to bed. She left her ladyship in bed, without fire or candle. Lord Walsingham slept in another apartment on the second floor, on the opposite side of the staircase. Witness slept in a spare room on the story over lord Walsingham's room. She went to bed about eleven o'clock, and awoke about two, when she was alarmed by the noise of water running. She opened her bed-room window, and called fire. She ran down stairs in her night-clothes and escaped,



but could not tell how, she was in such a state of terror. There were four rooms on the second floor, and witness did not see the fire in his lordship's room till some time afterwards. She saw lady Walsingham after she had leapt from the window, in dreadful agony, and observed that she believed her lord was burnt. She did not state why she leapt from the window instead of going down the staircase.—John Richard Ellmore stated, that he was called in, soon after two o'clock that morning, to attend lady Walsingham. He found her ladyship dreadfully wounded in a loft over the coachman's stable. On examination, found a cut on the forehead, another over the eye, the nose broken, and both thigh bones fractured; the greater part of the bone of the one protruded just above the knee joint three or four inches. The right arm was broken, the elbow of which was literally crushed to pieces. Notwithstanding these numerous severe injuries, her ladyship was perfectly sensible, and expressed strong anxiety for the fate of lord Walsingham, continually exclaiming, that "he must be lost," and wished to know if any thing had been heard of him. Archdeacon de Grey, the brother-in-law of lord Walsingham, was present, and asked if her ladyship had any wish respecting the execution of a testamentary paper, and she replied she was so confused and agonized, as to be incapable. She was in a dying state, and a clergyman was introduced, who prayed with her, and a little before six o'clock she emitted from her stomach a great quantity of blood; she was suffocated. Before she expired, she stated that she was awoken by the smoke, which filled her room, and

she opened the window and threw herself on the leads below. She said, she believed the fire had broke out in Lord Walsingham's room, and she had previously expressed to Dr. Clarke, her fear that some serious accident would occur through his lordship's carelessness.—Jane Mills, housemaid to the deceased, was awoken by the ringing of bells, about two o'clock, in either her lord or lady's bedroom. Got up instantly, and lady Walsingham's maid said the house was on fire. Witness said, "nonsense," but ran down stairs on observing smoke, and opened lord Walsingham's room-door. Observed the bed-drapery and the clothes in flames; the smoke and heat were so oppressive she could only call out, and receiving no answer, she ran through lady Walsingham's room, who asked what was the matter? Witness replied, his lordship's bed-curtains were on fire. She ran to another room to get water, but, before she could get it, and return to his lordship's room with the water, a voice called to her to escape, and she put down the water and escaped down stairs. There was no fire then in her ladyship's room, and she might have escaped with ease, if she had had presence of mind. His lordship always had a candle and fire in his room.—A fireman deposed to finding his lordship's body, burnt to a cinder, in the ruins in the drawing-room, at six o'clock that morning.—The Jury returned a verdict, "that the deaths of the deceased were caused accidentally, and by misfortune."

27. ILLUMINATION. — Parliament having been dissolved on the 22nd, on account of the hostility manifested by the House of Commons to the Reform Bill,



which had been introduced by ministers, the reformers of London endeavoured to get up an illumination on Monday, the 25th, in honour of the event; but that having been a failure, they prevailed on the Lord Mayor to announce another for the evening of Wednesday, the 27th. On that evening, accordingly, the illumination took place, and was pretty general, especially in the city, and in those districts which, by the bill, were to receive new members of their own, all persons being compelled either to illuminate, or to see their property destroyed. The mobs did a great deal of mischief. A numerous rabble proceeded along the Strand, destroying all windows that were not lighted. On arriving opposite Northumberland-house, they instantly demolished the windows. They then proceeded to Pall Mall, where they broke several windows which were not illuminated. The United Service Club, in Waterloo-place, and several other club houses in the vicinity, were seriously damaged. In St. James's-square they broke the windows in the houses of the bishop of London, the marquis of Cleveland, and lord Grant-ham. The bishop of Winchester, and Mr. W. W. Wynn, seeing the mob approach, placed candles in their windows, which thus escaped. The mob then proceeded to St. James's-street, where they broke the windows of Crockford's, Jordan's, the Guards', and other club houses. They next went to the duke of Wellington's residence in Piccadilly, and discharged a shower of stones, which broke several windows. The duke's servants fired out of the windows over their heads to frighten them, but without effect. The policemen then informed

the mob that the corpse of the duchess of Wellington was on the premises, which arrested further violence against Apsley-house. They turned up Park-lane, and broke some windows in the duke of Gloucester's house. They then demolished the whole of the windows in the marquis of Londonderry's mansion, and, having done similar damage to the premises of other gentlemen, proceeded to Privy Gardens, and broke sir Robert Peel's windows. The house of sir Robert Wilson, too, who used to be an idol of the mob, was attacked, and the windows broken, because, while he supported the bill, he disapproved of that part of it, which went to diminish the number of English members.

22. COLLISION OF STEAM-VESSELS.—At about a quarter before eight, the Venus steam-vessel, captain Clark, having on board 280 passengers from Gravesend, arrived in Limehouse-reach, when a new government steamer, called the Firefly (which had been on trial during the afternoon) appeared in sight, standing on towards Greenwich, on the other side of the river; but, upon nearing the Venus, she altered her course, and took a position, apparently with the view of crossing the bows of the Venus, and, as that vessel was coming up with considerable pressure, on the top of a flood-tide, she neared the Firefly, before the latter vessel could effect her object; and, although repeatedly called to by the captain of the Venus to alter her course, it was not attempted until too late, and the consequence was, she came with such prodigious violence against the Venus, as to carry away her own foremast by the board, tearing away the cutwater and figure-head of the Venus, and



rebounding for a moment, fell again on board the *Venus*, tore away her paddle-box, as well as her own; so that both vessels were for a time complete wrecks.

24. READING.—EFFECTS OF LIGHTNING.—On Tuesday morning last, this town and neighbourhood were visited by a heavy thunder-storm. It passed from the east to the north-west, with violent rain, and loud and repeated peals. About eleven, whilst two teams were at plough in an open field, and on low lands, belonging to Mr. William Dodd, of Checkendon, Oxon, the electric fluid burst on one of the teams, and instantly deprived of life two lads, aged sixteen and eighteen, and the two fore horses; the ploughman of the other team received a violent blow on the head, but did not fall: the distance between the teams was about fifty yards. The bodies of the unfortunate youths were immediately taken to Mr. Dodd's farm; that of the eldest, named Prior, exhibited shocking marks of the power of the electric fluid;—a deep wound on the temple, burnt furrows on the chest, the bottom of the foot torn, and toes mutilated; his dress torn open and laid back, his high shoes forced off and shivered; his face was also covered with blood which had proceeded from the ear. The other, named Goodey, had not received so much injury: the only apparent wounds were on the temple and the foot.

---

### MAY.

2. EXTRAORDINARY ROBBERY.—AN IRISH MISER.—A robbery took place in Dublin under the following circumstances:—An old man, of the name of Michael Dud-

ley, retired into a yard at the rear of a house in Sycamore-alley, at one o'clock in the afternoon. There he was followed and attacked by five or six fellows, who seized and threw him down, and, while one prevented him from crying out, or making any alarm, the others took from his person a Bank of Ireland note for 100*l.*, several 10*l.* and 5*l.* notes, amounting in the whole to 50*l.*; some 30*s.* and 1*l.* notes, to the amount of 8*l.* 10*s.*, and 16*s.* in silver, together with some coppers, making altogether a sum of 160*l.* The robbers immediately decamped with their booty, but two of them were apprehended the same evening, while endeavouring to get one of the 1*l.* notes changed. This led to the apprehension of two more of the gang in a short time after. A 30*s.* note, and a 1*l.* note, the former of which one of the fellows dropped in the street on being apprehended, was all of the property that was recovered. Dudley, an old miserable looking creature, was of very eccentric character, and a most extraordinary miser. The 100*l.* note had come into his possession seventeen years ago, when it fell to him as a legacy, bequeathed to him by a relative. Since that period to the present, he never for a moment let it out of his possession, and could not even be induced to part with it in exchange for a note of the present currency. The remaining 60*l.*, which also kept close companionship with the former, he accumulated by cleaning shoes at the Castle Tavern, in Essex-street, and by occasionally begging. With all this money, which he constantly carried about him, carefully stowed in an old red-pocket book, in a side coat pocket, he has been known to deny himself the commonest necessaries to sustain existence, and has been



frequently seen endeavouring to satisfy the cravings of nature by picking up a wretched meal amongst the refuse of the green stalls and offals of the market. Lodging he had none, save the miserable shelter, if shelter that could be called, afforded by a garret room in a dismantled, deserted, old tenement in Sycamore-alley. About five years back he had been an inmate of an hospital, where he got a suit of clothes, which were never replaced.

7. EXTENSIVE ROBBERY.—On Saturday, the 7th, a hackney-coach drove up to the door of Mr. Rowlands, jeweller, Coventry-street, Haymarket, and set down a well-dressed man, who, in an Irish accent, requested to look at several articles of jewellery, observing, at the same time, that he wished to see some of a very superior description, as he wanted to make a present of them to his wife. Several cases of jewellery were laid before him, and he selected a gold double-bottomed watch, with gold dial and chased sides, a large gold neck-chain, with bright and dead links, and snaps set with torquoise; a gold cross, set with rubies and a large emerald in the centre, and a gold curb watch chain, the whole amounting in value to nearly 100*l*. After making this selection, he said, that, although the articles met with his approbation, perhaps they would not meet with that of his wife, and, as she was confined to her bed, he should wish her to see them before he made a final purchase, and, if he left the money, perhaps Mr. Rowlands would have no objection to return the amount deposited, in case his good lady should be fastidious enough to find fault with them. Mr. Rowlands made no objection to this proposal, and was about to make out the amount of

the articles, when the purchaser observed, that perhaps it would save trouble if Mr. Rowlands would allow his son to accompany him home, as he only resided in Jermyn-street, where he had taken lodgings recently. Although Mr. Rowlands had considerable doubts, from the man's appearance, that all was not right, still the fellow's manner lulled his suspicion, and he consented to allow his son to accompany him, cautioning the young man, however, not to part with the articles without having the amount of them handed over to him. To make sure that no swindling should take place, Mr. Rowlands, after the coach had gone off with the stranger, his son, and the valuables, ordered another of his sons to follow it, and to station himself opposite the house they should enter, and, if anything should happen to excite his suspicion, immediately to act as circumstances should dictate to him. On the coach setting them down in Jermyn-street, the fellow introduced Mr. Rowlands's son into the dining-room of a highly respectable establishment, and asked him to wait while he stepped into the adjoining room, to which there was a door from the dining-room, to show the jewellery to his wife. The swindler, it would appear, had no sooner entered the next room, than he made his exit by another door, which led from the bed-room to the landing, and made a retreat down stairs into the street. The young man who was standing sentry outside observed this movement, and instantly running over to the house, pulled the bell violently, in order to ascertain if the sudden departure of the stranger was with the knowledge of his brother. Not obtaining a satisfactory answer from the girl who opened the door, he



made his way up stairs, when he met his brother, who, becoming impatient, had opened the folding-door to look after the fugitive, and, instead of finding a lady, discovered that his customer and the jewellery were gone. On inquiry being made of the proprietor of the house, he said no such person lodged there, but that the fellow had come in the morning, and requested to look at the lodgings, which were to let. After viewing them he departed, observing that he should call in the afternoon, and bring his brother with him to look at them. To lull suspicion, he had no sooner reached the outside of the door than he returned, and, after apologizing for the trouble he had incurred, said, that, as his brother kept his cab and pair of horses, he would wish to know if there were any stables near, where they could stand at livery. Upon being informed that there were very excellent ones in York-mews, adjoining, he said that he had no doubt that the lodgings, and the facility of baiting the horses, would meet with his brother's entire satisfaction, and they might depend on his accompanying him to view them in the afternoon. When the fellow and Mr. Rowlands were put down at the door, the servant believing it to be "the gentleman and his brother," who had come to look at the apartments, made not the slightest hesitation in allowing them to proceed up stairs, without making any inquiry.

**SUICIDE PREVENTED.**—A young man climbed over the parapet of Waterloo-bridge, and deliberately stripped himself, with the apparent intention of precipitating himself into the river. An alarm being given, several persons soon col-

lected on the bridge near the spot, and, climbing on the parapet endeavoured to persuade him to abandon his determination. He was assured, that, if distress was the cause of his intention to drown himself, he should be immediately relieved, and that every assistance should be given to him to procure for him some employment. He appeared to be deaf or insensible to the kindness that was shown to him; and, rolling himself every now and then towards the edge of the projection on the outside of the bridge, it was every instant expected that the act would be completed. Two boatmen were prepared with a boat near the arch below, to endeavour to save him, if he should throw himself into the river. A waterman at length, at imminent risk, got over the parapet, and partly by persuasion, but more by force, compelled him to return over the balustrade.

**DEATH OF SIR JOSEPH YORKE.**—An inquest was held at Hamble-rice, on view of the bodies of Admiral Sir J.S. Yorke, K.C.B., Captain Matthew Barton Bradby, R.N., Captain Thomas Yonge, R.N., and John Chandler, seaman, who were drowned by the upsetting of the Catherine, a yacht of about fourteen tons burden, near Brown-down Point, between Portsmouth and Hamble, at about four o'clock on Thursday afternoon. The unfortunate gentlemen were returning from Spithead, under a press of canvass, when a sudden squall took the vessel, which immediately went down stern foremost, in ten fathoms water. The accident was seen by a fisherman about half a mile off, and he immediately hastened to their assistance. He first came to Chandler, who had not been in the water more than



five or six minutes, and was yet alive and sensible, but speechless and exhausted. The next ten minutes were occupied in unsuccessful attempts to preserve the poor fellow's life. Meantime the three unfortunate gentlemen floated without attention, being completely enveloped in their cloaks and great coats, which so encumbered and concealed their bodies, as to be mistaken for empty garments. As soon, however, as the fisherman discovered that they were bodies, he took out those of Captains Bradby and Yonge, which had been in the water about a quarter of an hour, but life was quite extinct. The body of Sir Joseph Yorke floated farther down, and was picked up about the same time by another boat, with no sign of life. The bodies were conveyed to Hamble to await the inquest, which was held the following day. Verdict—*Accidental death.*

14. ROBBERY AT LORD NELSON'S.—BOW-STREET.—Application was made with respect to a most extensive robbery which had been perpetrated between six and nine o'clock the preceding evening, at the house of Earl Nelson, Portman-square. Earl Nelson had left town for the purpose of attending the funeral of the Dowager Lady Nelson, and this circumstance, it was supposed, was known to the parties concerned in the robbery, who must have had some previous knowledge not only of the affairs of the family, but of the house. On Saturday morning Lady Nelson discovered that a small morocco jewel-case which usually lay upon her dressing-table had been completely emptied of its contents, consisting of several articles of jewellery; and on going to her bureau in the same room, she found

that it had been forced open by means of a chisel, or some such instrument, and she immediately missed a large diamond hoop, a ruby hoop, a topaz cross, several gold chains, gold collars, bracelets, two large emerald hoops and clasps, also six bottles with silver tops in the shape of coronets, &c. The servants declared that they knew nothing respecting the robbery, or by whom it could have been effected. The premises were then examined, and it was at first thought that the thieves had entered the house from the top, to which they had gained access by means of an empty house in a street adjoining. No trace, however, could be discovered to give colour to such a supposition, and an inspector of police, who had been subsequently called in, declared that the thieves could not have effected an entrance by that means. The under-butler, on searching at the back part of the house, produced an empty jewel case belonging to Lady Nelson, which he said he found on a parapet wall—a circumstance that would lead to the belief that the thieves had left it there in effecting their escape. It was most remarkable, however, that although the jewel-case must have been exposed to the night air for so many hours, no appearance of damp was observed upon it, and neither were the gold ornaments on the box, nor the brass-work about it, at all soiled or tarnished. There was another circumstance which led to the belief that the robbery was not the work of common burglars. At about nine o'clock on Friday night Lady Nelson's sister heard a pull at the house-bell; and as she expected a dress-maker to call with some



articles she had ordered, she went to the drawing-room to see if it was she. On looking out, she saw the under-butler in conversation with a female, the singularity of whose dress attracted her attention, but she thought no more about the circumstance at the time. In the morning, however, when the robbery was discovered, she bethought of the strange-looking woman, whom she had seen in conversation with the under-butler; but when he was spoken to on the subject, he denied flatly the lady's statement, who declared that she was willing to make affidavit of the fact. Although the articles stolen were of considerable value, it was fortunate that the thieves had not carried off a much larger booty, as her ladyship's diamonds, which were valued at 80,000*l.*, were all in the same bureau from which the articles missing had been stolen. There was one article in particular which had escaped the thieves, although they might readily have laid their hands upon it, as it was loosely wrapped in a piece of brown paper, and carelessly thrown into the bureau. This was the diamond aigrette presented by the Grand Seigneur to Admiral Lord Nelson, who was in the habit, on state occasions, of wearing it in his hat.

STAMPS ON NEWSPAPERS. — COURT OF EXCHEQUER. — *The King v. William Carpenter.* — This was an information filed by the Attorney-general, at the instance of the Commissioners of the Stamp Duties. The information contained twelve counts, in some of which the defendant was charged with having published and exposed for sale a certain weekly newspaper, without having previously made and deposited in the office of the commissioners, the affidavit

required in such cases, by the 38th George 3rd, cap. 78. For every instance of publication without such affidavit, the defendant became liable to a penalty of 100*l.* In other counts the defendant was charged with having on divers days published a weekly newspaper, without having paid the duty of 4*d.* imposed upon every number of every such paper, by the 55th of the same King; for every omission in the payment of the duty, he had incurred a penalty of 20*l.* The publication was charged to have taken place upon the 9th of October, 1830, and on sixteen other subsequent days, and the description of the paper was varied, by calling it "a paper answering the purposes of a newspaper, and containing news, intelligence, or occurrences." The defendant had pleaded that he was not guilty, and appeared in person to make his own defence.—The Attorney-general read some extracts from the prospectus of the paper. It was headed, "Liberty of the Press asserted;" and after adverting to and denouncing the Acts of Parliament by which the publication of newspapers is regulated, it went on to state, that Mr. Carpenter had discovered a method of evading them by the mere circumstance of bringing out the paper at irregular periods, and in such a form, that the numbers were apparently unconnected with each other. He expressed his astonishment that persons connected with the newspaper press had not sooner made so plain a discovery, and proposed to carry it into effect for the public benefit upon the 9th of October, 1830, on which day he promised to publish a Political Letter, addressed to a friend or enemy, as the case might be, and containing a



comprehensive digest of important events, and passing occurrences, with original observations by himself. This letter he proposed to follow up every week with a "similar though totally distinct and separate publication:" the price was to be 4*d.* As by evading the duty, he would be enabled to undersell the other vendors of newspapers, he reckoned upon a circulation extensive in proportion to the cheapness of the paper; and after calling the attention of advertisers to the advantages which they must derive from advertising in the *Political Letter*, he invited them to send in their advertisements to his office before noon on every Thursday.—The Attorney-general contended, that the paper in question was a newspaper according to the definition given of a newspaper in the Act of 60 George 3*rd*, ch. 9, sec. 1, which was in these words—"All pamphlets and papers containing any public news, intelligence, or occurrences, or any remarks or observations thereon, or upon any matter in church or state, printed in any part of the United Kingdom, for sale, and published periodically, or in parts, or numbers, at intervals not exceeding twenty-six days between the publication of any two such pamphlets or papers, parts, or numbers, where any of the said pamphlets or papers, parts, or numbers respectively shall not exceed two sheets, or shall be published for a less sum than 6*d.*, exclusive of the duty, shall be deemed and taken to be newspapers, within the true intent and meaning of the several statutes" before enacted upon the subject. The learned gentleman then proceeded to examine particularly the papers in question. The first, dated on

the 9th of October, was in the shape of a letter addressed to the Duke of Wellington, and, after reciting and commenting upon the events going on at home and abroad, the writer introduced other articles of information, in such a form as this:—"I beg to acquaint your Grace that hops are fallen to-day, the price being" (stating the market price at that time). Other facts, as the price of the public stocks, of butchers' meat, &c. were communicated to the public in the same way. The letter concluded by stating, that the writer had intended to address a second letter to the Duke of Wellington, but that the position of Sir Robert Peel rendered it necessary for Mr. Carpenter to address a "Monitory Letter" to that right hon. gentleman. This monitory letter accordingly occupied the second paper, which was published on the 15th of October, and which, within the framework and form of an epistle, included the usual varieties and news to be found in newspapers, classed under their respective heads. The publication was conducted in this manner for some time, when the shape of the paper was changed from 8vo to 4to, the subscribers having at this time increased, as the defendant asserted, from 19,000 to 63,000. It was for the Jury to say whether the alteration of the title and of the size of the paper, together with the fact that the paper was not published on the same day in every week, was sufficient to exempt the paper from the payment of the stamp duties. He (the Attorney-general) contended, that such alterations and want of regularity could produce no such exemption. One of the papers was published in every week; each paper referred



to the preceding and the subsequent one; and Mr. Carpenter, in a number lately published, had expressed his intention to print a title-page to the work, so that the whole of the numbers might be bound up together. There could (the Attorney-general said) be no doubt whatever that such a publication was "a paper published in parts or numbers at intervals not exceeding twenty-six days, and sold for a less sum than sixpence;" and that, therefore, it was a newspaper within the meaning and influence of the statutes under which these proceedings had been instituted. The defendant having admitted the facts, addressed the Jury in a speech which occupied six hours, in praise of the liberty of the press, and vituperation of all stamp duties.—The Lord Chief Baron said, that he was most clearly of opinion, even adopting the defendant's own rule of construction, that the paper was a newspaper.—The Jury returned a verdict for the Crown.—The Attorney-general imposed only one penalty for each class of offences, making the whole fine amount to 120*l*.

**CALAMITOUS ACCIDENT.**—A distressing accident took place at the Colbrook Vale Iron Works, Monmouthshire, by which nine lives were lost. From the nature of the workings in one of the coal levels, a very considerable accumulation of water had been for some time forming, and to guard against meeting it unexpectedly, very particular instructions had been given not to carry on the work without first boring to the right and left, and also in advance. For several weeks those operations had been continued; but about mid-day, on the 27th, the water broke in upon that part of the works where four-

teen colliers were employed, with such impetuosity that three only were enabled to reach the pits, and thereby escape. All the resources of the company for clearing the water, aided by those of the Nantyglo and Blaina Iron Works, were promptly brought into operation, and uninterruptedly continued with complete effect. On Sunday morning, one of the men who was found alive, reported that some others, in all probability, had also escaped, by retreating to the extremity of their stalls. That hope congregated thousands about the works the whole of Sunday, and although great expectations were entertained that three or four would have been recovered, at five o'clock in the afternoon one only (and that the last) was brought out, having been entombed for nearly fifty-five hours after the accident. The whole of the bodies were found. A coroner's inquest pronounced a verdict of "Accidental Death."

31. **SOMNAMBULISM.**—About three o'clock in the morning, a young man, about twenty years of age, was observed running at an extremely rapid pace along Dean Street, Westminster, and through the various other streets, in almost a state of nudity, till he arrived near the Thames at Milbank, where he halted, exclaiming in an agonizing tone, "Oh, save them, save them! my wife, my child, my love!" and after the pause of an instant, "Oh, they are not there! they are gone! I must follow!" at the same time running towards the Thames. The person, who had observed him in Dean Street, had (although himself a swift runner), with great difficulty kept up with him: however, perceiving his intention, he



caught hold of the somnambulist when in the act of rushing into the water. Upon being stopped, the latter burst into tears; but on recovering himself in some degree, he appeared conscious of his dangerous situation; and, after thanking his protector for his kind offices, and assuring him he had never been known to walk in his sleep before, he hastily retreated homewards.

**INQUEST AND SUSPECTED MURDER.**—An inquest was held at Sydenham, on the body of a young woman, found in the Croydon canal, near that place, on Sunday the 29th. It appeared that, on the evening of the preceding Monday (23rd), the deceased, with another female about her own age, went into the shop of Mrs. Stacey, on Sydenham Common, and purchased articles for making tea, for which she paid 10*d.*, and asked Mrs. Stacey if she could accommodate her with hot water in the course of the evening, which Mrs. Stacey promised to do. She said she was going to meet the young gentleman who was the father of the child of which she was pregnant, and would return to take tea, and then went away with her companion. About a quarter past seven she was seen in a boat in the broad water of the canal, and a young gentleman rowing her about, her female friend was in another boat with another gentleman. They did not return to Mrs. Stacey's, and the next morning the boats were seen floating on the broad water, deserted:—no suspicion, however, was excited. But on Sunday morning Mrs. Stacey's son observing a woman's bonnet and veil on the surface of the water, procured a boat and went to the spot, when he discovered the body

of the deceased. It was brought to the village, when it was instantly recognized by Mrs. Stacey and a number of the villagers. There was a small key in her pocket, but no money or papers of any kind by which her name might be discovered. There was a fracture on the forehead, and both eyes were blackened by contusion, from which it was concluded she had been murdered. Inquiry was instantly set on foot for the young man with whom she had been seen, and for her female companion, but without obtaining the least information respecting either. A policeman stated, that, about three weeks ago, late in the evening, he observed the same female walking in a desponding state upon the banks of the same canal, and questioned her, when she admitted, with tears in her eyes, that she meditated self-destruction. He took her to the station-house, where she said her name was Mary Clarke, and that she lived at Highgate, but refused to give any account of herself. In her pocket was then found the same key which was in her pocket when taken out of the canal. She left the station-house in the morning, and promised to return home.

The Jury returned a verdict—“*Found Drowned,*” but expressed their hope that the investigation would be continued, as there was great reason to apprehend that the deceased had been unfairly dealt with.

---

## JUNE.

3. **EXTENSIVE SEIZURE.**—Early on the morning of the third, four revenue-officers, went to Belvedere-cottage, Warm-lane, Willesden-green, in consequence of a



suspicion that illicit transactions were going on there. After considerable hesitation, occasioned by the very respectable outward appearance of the place, they resolved to do their duty as far as their information went. No notice was taken of their applications for admittance at the front door, and, upon going to the back part of the premises, they found that the only accessible point was protected by a dog. Ridding themselves of this difficulty, they gained an entrance by the back door, and in the parlour, coach-house, and stable (all connected with each other), they found a private soap-manufactory, in which was a copper capable of making at one boil about two tons of soap, a vast number of frames, nearly a ton of manufactured soap, twenty-two cwt. of tallow, four cwt. of rosin, about eight-hundred gallons of strong lees, and other materials and utensils used in manufacturing soap. It appeared from documents found upon the premises, that this business had been going on for four months.

RIOTS IN WALES. — MERTHYR. — There was a general "turn out" of all the work-men four days ago. They met at a place called Twyn-y-wain, and it was expected there would have been a disturbance in the evening, but they dispersed, and did not show any formidable appearance till the next day, Thursday the 2nd, when they assembled in considerable numbers, and paraded the streets all day. Being instigated by several men of bad character, (some of whom had had their goods seized for debt), they proceeded in large bodies to the house of Mr. Coffin, who was an officer of the Court of Requests, and demanded the books belonging

to it, which being refused, they became very violent and tumultuous, threatening to murder Mr. Coffin and others. The Magistrates got upon some chairs, but were insulted by the mob, and were obliged to desist. They then broke into Coffin's house, smashed all his windows, and gutted the place of every article of furniture, which they burnt in a heap in the middle of the street. This took place about nine o'clock in the evening. The Magistrates then thought it necessary to send for the aid of the military stationed at Brecon. They arrived at Merthyr on Friday, about twelve o'clock, and marched to the Castle Inn, in the centre of the town, where the Magistrates were assembled. A party of the soldiers were ordered inside the house, and the remainder kept guard outside, and were supplied with refreshments. The mob then threatened the Magistracy, that, unless they were allowed something to eat as well as the military, in one hour they would destroy every individual in the inn, and the ringleader, "Lewis, the huntsman," took out his watch to mark the time. When the time had elapsed within ten minutes, Lewis again threatened that, if his demands were not complied with, he and his associates were determined to destroy both the military and magistrates. The mob then began to press upon the soldiers on every side, and had at last pressed them against the wall, and jammed them so closely, that their arms were useless, and the men were unable to defend themselves. The mob then began to deprive the soldiers of their pieces and side-arms, and, during some severe struggle which ensued, many were wounded. At this moment the soldiers stationed



in the inn were ordered to fire, when the mob speedily took to flight, but not until they had taken about thirty stand of arms from the military. Of the mob, at least twenty-three were either killed on the spot, or died afterwards. The number of the wounded was uncertain, but several suffered amputation. On Saturday the mob had dispersed, and sent messages to the surrounding works to meet on Monday at Merthyr, but by this time the military had been reinforced by a detachment of dragoons and yeomanry, and marched out to meet them. The riot act was read by a magistrate who accompanied the soldiers, and they were ordered to present their pieces, at the sight of which every man took to his heels and returned home.

6. THEFT BY A CLERGYMAN.—HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY. — The Rev. Duncan M'Caig, minister of a Gothic chapel in Edinburgh, and in high repute for his evangelical preaching, was placed at the bar, charged with having stolen from Mr. Richardson, bookseller, a quarto bible, four volumes of Bunyan's works, the works of John Newton, the first and fifteenth volumes of Constable's Miscellany; from Mr. West, bookseller, a Lexicon; and from Mr. Watson, bookseller, Johnson's Dictionary in 8vo., the works of Paley and Josephus; from Carfrae and Son, booksellers, Johnson's Dictionary in 8vo., the Lady's Poetical Album, Græcum Lexicum Manuale, Gertrude of Wyoming, and other Poems, by Thomas Campbell, and Stewart's Philosophical Essays, in 8vo.; Latin Synonyms and the works of Sophocles, in Greek, from the sale-room of Maclachlan and Stewart;

from the shop of Richard Ireland, the works of Aristotle, Young's Night Thoughts, Virgil's Works, by Dryden, the Poetical works of John Milton, Kirk White's Remains, the works of Robert Burns, Outlines of Moral Philosophy in 8vo., the English version of the Polyglott Bible, the works of Sallust, and English Synonyms Explained, by Crabbe, Xenophon's Anabasis, Latin and Greek; from the shop of Mr. Tait, the Heart of Mid-Lothian (printed abroad), Terence's Comedies, the rule and Exercise of Holy Living, by Jeremy Taylor, Clavis Pentateuchi, F. Vigeri Idiotismi Græci, the first volume of Hermes, and Quintiliani Institutiones Oratoriæ; a Greek Testament from Messrs. Laing; Thomson's Seasons, from Pollock and Co.; and the fourth and fifth volumes of Ovid's Works, from Mr. Adam Black.

Walter Richardson, bookseller, Leith—had a sale of books at 10, Hunter-square, Edinburgh, in March last; it began on the 2nd of that month, and continued for six days. On the first night of the sale he missed two volumes of Constable's Miscellany—one of the volumes was "Converts from Infidelity," and the other "The Rebellion in Scotland in 1745." On the 3rd of March witness missed Newton's Works, in one volume; was quite certain that that book was there at the commencement of the sale; and that it was, missing when they came to it in the catalogue. On the 5th, missed Bunyan's Works, in four volumes; that edition of Bunyan consisted of six volumes; it was the four first volumes that were taken, the last two were left. Was certain the volumes were in the room at the commencement of the sale. On the Tuesday follow-



ing, the last day of the sale, he missed a royal quarto Bible before the sale began. It was seen there about twenty minutes before seven; and whilst witness and his clerk were engaged for a few seconds in raising one of the windows, the volume was taken from the table. After the sale two of witness's assistants went down to a Mr. Spence's to get some refreshment, whither witness soon followed; and in consequence of a communication with Mr. Dunsmure, he met a Mr. James, a man of colour, who attends the Reading-room in the Merchants' Hall, Hunter-square, from whom he learned that he (James) had some books in his keeping, which he had reason to believe were witness's. James showed him the Bible, which he identified as his property; and, as arranged, James took back the Bible, and locked it up. Witness then went and gave information at the Police Office; and about four o'clock in the afternoon of next day, a police-officer brought him the same Bible, and witness went with the officer to M'Caig's house, where all the volumes he had spoken to were found, mostly lying on the floor. One of the volumes of Constable's Miscellany was missing for some time; but M'Caig said there was another—he had been reading it that day; and at last it was found between two octavos. The books were put on a table, and marked by the officers of police. Was quite certain he had not sold any of those books. — Thomas James; Had been waiter at the Merchants' Hall for three years; Mr. M'Caig read there, whether a subscriber or not he could not tell. Recollects his leaving books with witness on Saturday the 5th of March—the books were four vols.

of Bunyan's Works. He (witness) was no scholar—he could not read the names, but he knew the books by the plates. They were left between seven and eight in the evening, and he returned in about three quarters of an hour, and got them. On Tuesday evening 8th March, a half Bible was left—had no doubt the Bible produced was the same—got it from him at twenty-five minutes past seven—witness having been at the Gazette Office, knew the hour. On going up stairs, Mr. M'Caig gave him the book and asked him to keep it for him as he did the others; saying, that he would call for it.—Alexander M'Gregor, criminal officer, knew prisoner, and took him into custody on the 9th of March, as he was coming down the stair of Merchants' Hall Reading Room. He had a Bible in his possession, and took him with it to the Police Office. He was carrying the book openly, and wore no cloak. He made no resistance.—Peter Cairns; Was a bookseller for some time in Edinburgh, and was employed by Mr. Richardson, to assist at a sale in March last. Was there on Saturday the 4th or 5th March, when Bunyan's Works were missed. The work was in six volumes, but only four were taken away. The books were on the table at the beginning of the sale, and in its progress M'Caig looked at Bunyan, and remarked that they were not uniform. Witness did not know him then, but knew him again. He had one of the volumes under his arm at the time. Witness looked up to the auctioneer a little, and when he again turned his eyes to the table he exclaimed, "Bunyan's works are gone, and the gentleman also." The prisoner had not the books in



his hand when witness last saw them, but he had them certainly not more than a minute before they were missed. Saw no other person lift or examine Bunyan's works that night. Identified the volumes.—Edward West, auctioneer, had a sale of books, at 10, Hunter Square, in January last, at which a copy of Johnson's Dictionary was for sale, but was certain that it was not sold, as a person wished to buy it, and it could not be produced, but he did not know till afterwards what had become of it. Had a sale on the 10th February, at which there was a Greek Lexicon; the sale began about seven o'clock. A person handed the book to witness, and requested that it might be put up, on which witness said, he would put it up at a guinea, but he must have an advance on that sum. It was handed back to the person, and the book was missed in ten minutes after. The person was dressed in a camblet cloak. On the 10th March, witness was sent by the police to Mr. M'Caig's house in Wharton-place, where he found Johnson's Dictionary and the Lexicon; they were on the floor of the library, among a great many other books. Saw Mr. M'Caig there, and again in gaol, and on these occasions had a strong belief that he was the person who handed up the Lexicon, and the same impression still remained on his mind.—Mr. Carfrae was employed to sell the entire stock of Pollock and Company in January last. On the 28th, Gertrude of Wyoming was on the table at eleven forenoon, missed by one; same day, a copy of Stewart's Essays was taken away; it was on the table at three in the afternoon, and was wanting

VOL. LXXIII.

when he came to sell it between seven and nine. On 1st Feb. a Greek Lexicon was taken away; it was seen at three, and missed in the evening. On the 2nd Feb. Johnson's Dictionary, and the Lady's Poetical Album were in the catalogue, and he saw them on the table in the morning of that day. He sold Johnson's Dictionary to a gentleman for one guinea, and it was laid aside for him, but removed from the place. Saw these books on the 9th March in M'Caig's house. The prisoner went with witness and Lieutenant Paterson, and desired witness to take time and see if there were any of his books. He found the copy of Johnson, with the number of his catalogue on the back; the paper was torn off, but the green cloth had absorbed the ink, and 1193 appeared on it. He found Stewart's Essays under the table, and the Lexicon in the book-case. Went back next morning and found the other books; the Album was in the bed-room. Went over the different volumes, and identified them as his property.—Mr. Paterson, lieutenant of police, searched M'Caig's house, and found the different works libelled not otherwise spoken to. M'Caig said to him that he had purchased the books from William Stewart, a printer's lad, in the street, and at different times.—The Jury found Mr. M'Caig guilty of eleven of the various acts of theft charged, and he was sentenced to fourteen years transportation.

9. SALE OF HIS LATE MAJESTY'S CORONATION ROBES.—A portion of his late Majesty's costly and splendid wardrobe destined for public sale, including the magnificent coronation robes and



other costumes, was sold by auction, by Mr. Phillips, at his rooms in New Bond Street. There were 120 lots disposed of, out of which we subjoin the principal in the order in which they were put up:—

No. 13. An elegant yellow and silver sash of the Royal Hanoverian Guelphic Order, 3*l.* 8*s.*—

17. A pair of fine kid-trousers, of ample dimensions, and lined with white satin, was sold for 12*s.*—

35. The coronation ruff, formed of superb Mechlin-lace, 2*l.*—50. The costly Highland costume worn by our late Sovereign at Dalkeith Palace, the seat of his Grace the Duke of Buccleugh, in the summer of 1822, was knocked down at 40*l.*—

52. The sumptuous crimson-velvet coronation mantle, with silver star, embroidered with gold, on appropriate devices, and which cost originally, according to the statement of the auctioneer, upwards of 500*l.*, was knocked down at 47 guineas.—53. A crimson coat to suit with the above, 14*l.* — 55.

A magnificent gold body-dress and trousers, 26 guineas.—67. An extraordinary large white aigrette plume, brought from Paris by the Earl of Fife, in April, 1815, and presented by his lordship to the late King, was sold for 15*l.*—87.

A richly embroidered silver tissue coronation waistcoat and trunk hose, 13*l.*—95. The splendid purple velvet coronation mantle, sumptuously embroidered with gold, of which it was said to contain 200 ounces. It was knocked down at 55*l.*, although it was stated to have cost his late Majesty 300*l.*—96. An elegant and costly green velvet mantle, lined with ermine of the finest quality; presented by the Emperor Alexander to his late Majesty, which

cost upwards of 1,000 guineas, was knocked down at 125*l.*

10. RIOT AT DEAN FOREST. MONMOUTH.—A great portion of this forest was inclosed and planted with oak, under an act passed in the 48th of George 3rd, which plantations are now in a thriving state. The act provides, that 11,000 acres are always to be kept inclosed as a nursery for timber; and that the fences can be legally opened only by order of the Lords of the Treasury, and then only when the young timber shall be safe from the browsing of the cattle, sheep, and swine. An erroneous opinion, however, prevailed among the foresters, that the inclosures should be thrown open at the expiration of twenty-one years; and as the act was passed in 1808, several of the inclosures were now of a longer standing, and great dissatisfaction had been for some time felt at their continuance. About a fortnight ago, a portion of the embankment was secretly destroyed. A large reward was offered for the discovery of the offenders without effect, and handbills were circulated, cautioning against the recurrence of similar outrages. On the morning of the 8th, a body of men, about eighty, commenced levelling the embankments. In the course of the day, their numbers increased to 500. On Thursday the 9th, they continued the work of devastation, and their number increased to 2,000, parties being sent out in all directions to compel the colliers and other workmen to come and assist in opening the inclosures. Several miles of fences were levelled in these two days. The men worked regularly with suitable implements. They offered



no injury to persons or private property, and were particularly careful of the young timber.

15. ATTEMPT AT SUICIDE.—A gentleman, nearly allied to a noble family, entered the Cigar Divan, in King Street, Covent Garden, in a state of great excitement. Being personally known to the proprietor, he was advised, as he appeared unwell, to retire to the garden that is fitted up in the summer-months for the reception of visitors. He did so; and having ordered his refreshment took a seat at the extremity of the shrubbery. His agitation was so great as to render him nearly inarticulate, but this was attributed by the waiter to inebriation; and as he was seated where he could be no annoyance to the visitors of the Coffee-room, the attendants retired and left him alone. In a few minutes the report of a pistol was heard. On the proprietor of the Divan running into the garden, he found the unfortunate gentleman trembling very violently, holding a discharged pistol in his hand, and with a paper inclosing some mineral substance on the table before him. He said, that he always carried pistols for his personal security, and that it had been discharged accidentally. He was then asked what was in the paper, and he replied, "Salts." The word "poison," however, was upon the paper; and, on the contents being taken to a chymist's, they were pronounced to be oxalic acid. The bullet struck a tree behind the seat occupied by the gentleman, from which it is conjectured that he had pointed it at himself, but, from his agitation, discharged it over his shoulder. Under all the circumstances, the proprietor determined

on detaining him until his friends could be apprized of his situation. This he resisted, and demanded his liberation, but at length burst into tears, and mentioned the name of a gentleman, who was accordingly sent for. Nearly two hours elapsed before this relation was found, and then the unfortunate gentleman was conveyed away in a close carriage. He appeared in a dreadful state of nervous debility, conversed incoherently, and was frequently in tears.

ASSAULT. — COURT OF EXCHEQUER. — *Williams v. Hall.* — The plaintiff in this case, was a bookseller, and the defendant a plumber. From the plaintiff's evidence it appeared, that, on the 23rd of November last, the parties in the action, who had been before that time unknown to each other, met by accident at a public house in Smithfield. Some conversation having ensued upon the subject of duelling, the plaintiff expressed his disapprobation of the practice, and regretted much that, when he was in the army, he had been engaged in a duel with a brother officer, whom he shot dead. He afterwards, however, said, that it was fortunate for himself that he had not half-a-dozen sisters, as they would probably be the cause of his fighting so many duels, for if any man were to insult any of them, he would certainly challenge him. The defendant, upon this, put a case, and supposing that the plaintiff had a sister, and that the defendant had seduced her, he asked the plaintiff how he should behave. To this the plaintiff answered, that he would blow out the defendants brains, and knock off his head. After a little more wrangling of the same sort, the plaintiff,



after having repeatedly applied a disgusting epithet to the defendant, provoked him so much, that the latter, who had a wooden hand screwed into a plate of iron at the end of the stump of his arm, proceeded to unscrew the wooden part of the limb, and assaulted the plaintiff with the remainder. The parties fought for a considerable time, and the plaintiff was at length carried home. The witness who deposed on the part of the plaintiff, was cross-examined at great length, and admitted that all the original provocations proceeded from the plaintiff, and that the plaintiff had frequently referred, in terms of exultation, to the fact of his having shot one Callaway, at Malta, through the heart, and threatened to inflict the same fate upon the defendant. The witness, in his direct examination, swore that he was obliged to support the plaintiff to his house; but on his cross-examination he said, that the plaintiff wanted, at the end of the fight, to continue it longer, and that he boasted then of being able to beat fifty like the defendant. Some descriptions were attempted of the peculiar weapon used by the defendant, but as he was in court, the Lord Chief Baron thought it more satisfactory that the thing itself should be exhibited, and accordingly Mr. Hall stood up, and unscrewing his hand, displayed the nature of the machinery to the Jury.

The Lord Chief Baron said, that the plaintiff was entitled to a verdict, but that it was for the Jury to say, what damages ought to be given in such a case.—The Jury instantly, in a loud voice exclaimed, “A farthing! a farthing!”

17. INQUEST ON THE WELSH

RIOTERS.—The inquest on Hughes, one of the rioters killed at Merther Tydvil, [See page 79,] was held on the 17th June.

William Thomas esq., Comb, surgeon.—In about an hour after the mob had dispersed from the front of the Castle Inn, eight bodies were removed into the coach-house behind the inn, and nearly at the same time William Roberts came to witness, and told him there was a wounded man in his house, which was close by; he went there instantly, and found a man, whom he knew to be John Hughes, in Roberts's house; he examined him, and found a ball had entered the centre of his back, and come out rather above his navel; he died between ten and eleven o'clock that night: and his death was caused by that gun-shot wound. About an hour and a half before he died, when he knew that he was dying, witness asked him how he came to be shot; he said he was running away with a soldier's musket, but before he could do so he was shot. He said he had been an old soldier, and in six engagements, and never was wounded before, and that he ought to have died a better death. Witness was present when the firing at the Castle commenced by the soldiers. He came to the Castle Inn just as the soldiers halted on their arrival. A large mob accompanied them, a great proportion of which was armed with bludgeons, some with the handles of mandrels, others with parts of miner's pickaxes; a man amongst them had a red flag on a pole. The soldiers halted in the middle of the street, rather above the house. The mob got close around them in a dense mass, so that it was almost impossible



for them to use their arms. Some bread and cheese were then brought out to them, after which they were moved to the pavement in front of the Castle Inn, and near to the house. Here they were hemmed in again. Before this movement the Sheriff read the riot-act. He saw a man, called Lewis the huntsman, get up to the lamp-iron and support himself with the assistance of the mob below. He addressed them, saying "We are met here to have our wages raised, instead of which the masters have brought the soldiers against us; now, boys, if you are of the same mind as I am, let us fall upon them and take their arms away." He then dropped down. His speech was in Welch. In a minute or two witness observed a movement in the crowd, when a rush was made on the soldiers. Several of them were disarmed. At this moment witness came out to the front door of the house, and there saw the mob, three or four upon a soldier, wrestling for their muskets. Four or five of the soldiers were upon the ground, and at the same instant a volley of stones, cinders, sticks, &c., was sent against the windows. No firing had taken place at this moment. There was a conflict on the steps, the mob three or four times making their way into the house, and being as often repulsed by two soldiers in the passage, and the special constables behind them. The soldiers in the passage had been able to bring down their muskets to the charge; a firing commenced from the windows above, but not till several of the soldiers had been struck down. Some one in the passage then gave the alarm that the mob were

coming in at the rear of the house; hearing this, witness led an officer and three soldiers into the yard behind. The yard is very narrow, the mob had then advanced half way up the yard, and were within a very few yards of the back door; they fell back a little, and then assailed the soldiers with a shower of stones and brick-bats; the soldiers fired, two or three of the mob fell and then drew back, and were driven through the stable-yard into the street by the end of the house. It was then said the mob were approaching by the field; witness went round to see—met Lewis running by the river side, with a musket in his hand; heard him call out to the others to stop and stand their ground. Witness then went home by a circuitous way through Ynisgoy; the soldiers were firing in the street, and the mob were firing from the cinder-bank in the rear of the house; he thinks there was firing from thence before Lewis could have got there.

Several other witnesses were examined, and deposed to the mob having attacked and deprived some soldiers of their arms before a single shot was fired by the military. The major who commanded the detachment was severely cut. Nothing could exceed the exertions of the officers to prevent the unnecessary shedding of blood. The Jury brought in the following verdict:—"We unanimously find that John Hughes came to his death by a musket-shot wound, fired by a soldier of His Majesty's 93rd regiment, whose name is to the Jury unknown, and that it was a justifiable homicide."—Similar verdicts were returned in the other cases.



18. EVILS OF DEMANDING JUSTICE.—Sophia Chapman was placed at the bar of one of the police offices, and a tall, dark, well-dressed young man entered the witness box. The latter was asked his name, and what his charge was against the prisoner? He replied, in broken English, "My name is Ben Hyam; I am a Turk, and I travel with goods to sell; I met de woman de last night; I go home with her; I did show her de half-sovereign, which I had in a paper, and I put in my littel pocket where I put de watch. In the morning when I got up, I go to littel pocket, and no paper and no half-sovereign; but I find de paper in de breeches pocket, and de money gone. After de policeman came, de prisoner and landlady of de house say they will give me 8s. if I go away, as the girl ought to have 5s.; but de policeman say, 'No; give him nothing; it must go to justice.'—The prisoner said she never saw the half-sovereign.—Mr. Marriot. You must prosecute this woman for the robbery.—Ben Hyam. Me no want to prosecute, Sare; me shall lose my business in de country; it was not de half-sovereign I did care for so much; no, Sare, me no wish to prosecute, though she did rob me very bad.—Mr. Marriot. Oh, you don't wish to prosecute? Then I shall compel you; for, if you do not find sureties to prosecute, I will send you to gaol with her.—Ben Hyam. Pray, Sare, let me go; I do not care for the half-sovereign.—Mr. Marriot. You know your immoral conduct has been such, that you will not be allowed your expenses on the trial, so you do not wish to prosecute.—Ben Hyam. I do not know what

you say, Sare, about immoral; but I wish to go to my business, if you please, in de country.—Mr. Marriot.—Have you got bail to be answerable for your appearance.—Ben Hyam. Me have no friends except in de country.—The policeman confirmed the Turk's statement, and the latter, having signed his deposition, was locked up, and afterwards was handcuffed and taken by the gaoler, with the female, to Kingston; the latter being committed for the felony, and the former for want of sureties, to appear to give evidence against her at the next sessions.—He was subsequently liberated on his own recognizance.

EFFACING STAMPS.—COURT OF EXCHEQUER.—*Fluke v. Duke*.—Both parties to this action were law-stationers, and the action was brought to recover 108*l.*, which had become due to the plaintiff under the following circumstances:—In January of the present year, the defendant sent a message to the plaintiff, to intimate, that he (Duke) had a stamp for the articles of an attorney's clerk, which he wished to dispose of. He stated, at the same time, that he had received the stamp from a respectable customer, and would make Fluke an abatement of 10*l.* per cent in the price of it. Fluke agreed to purchase the article, and paid, or secured the payment of, 108*l.*, being the value of the stamp after the discount had been taken off. Soon afterwards, Fluke disposed of the stamp to an attorney, named Wilton, who engrossed upon it the articles of clerkship of a young man who had entered his office. The articles, after having been executed, were taken to the office



of the Master, where they are required by statute to be enrolled. But, it having come to the Master's knowledge that several sets of articles had been some time before stolen from his office, and that the stamps of such articles, after the ink had been discharged by a chymical process, had been offered for sale as unused stamps, and the present stamp having, in the Master's eye, an appearance of being one of the stamps stolen from the office, the Master refused to enrol the articles. An examination which took place at the Stamp-office confirmed the suspicion of the Master of the court of King's-bench; and the Commissioners of Stamps refused to give a fresh one in the room of that which had been used. Mr. Wilton being obliged to buy another stamp on which to engross the articles of clerkship for his apprentice, reclaimed the price of the stamp from Fluke, who reclaimed it from Duke: the latter promised for some time to arrange the matter, but at last refused to make any satisfaction, upon which the present proceedings were commenced against him.—These facts being proved by the plaintiff, the defendant called the "respectable customer" from whom he obtained the stamp, Abraham Slowman, a sheriff's officer. Mr. Slowman said, that the stamp had been given to him by a person named Alves, whom he had locked up in his custody at the time, and that the proceeds of the sale of the stamp by the witness to Duke were applied in satisfaction of the debt for which Alves was in custody. In his cross-examination, Slowman stated that Alves had no profession, but that he was a gentleman living in a very respectable

way, in furnished lodgings, upon the drawing-room floor, in a house in Duke-street, Portland-place. He said that Alves was in the habit of going to races; that he had been in custody in the witness's lock-up house about seven times within a year or two; and that he had other stamps for disposal, besides that which was the subject of the present action. One of these stamps, a second one, was disposed of by Slowman, as Alves's agent, to the defendant, about a fortnight after the inquiry which had been instituted at the Master's office.—The Lord Chief Baron asked Slowman whether Duke had made any inquiries of him concerning the character and circumstances of Alves?—Slowman answered in the negative, adding, that he supposed Mr. Duke had taken the stamps upon the faith of himself (Slowman), and without any reference to the party from whom the stamps ultimately came.—The Jury immediately found for the plaintiff for the whole amount of his demand.

**LIBEL. — ELECTIONEERING.**—*Howe v. Daubeny.*—This action arose out of certain proceedings at Great Grimsby, during the general election in 1830. The plaintiff was lieutenant of the Greyhound revenue cutter; the defendant, an attorney at Great Grimsby. The libel was the following letter, dated from Great Grimsby, and published in some of the London papers. The blues were the Whig party; the reds, their opponents:—"At the late election, some extraordinary interferences took place on the part of the persons employed in his majesty's revenue service here. The collector of the Customs was observed to join in the parade of



the red party, and in its greetings and huzzas! His majesty's revenue cutters, Greyhound and Lapwing, landed from seventy to eighty of their crews, who kicked up occasional rows, to intimidate the peaceful inhabitants and the blue party; and in one of these, which became a serious riot and affray, they were actually led on by one of the commanders, lieutenant Howe, of the Greyhound. This gentleman canvassed for the reds, attended their parades in his uniform, and wore a red riband, the cognizance of the party his efforts were intended to support. Several sailors were employed to erect a booth in front of the lodgings of the red candidates. A top-mast from the stores of the Greyhound was raised up, to which a stage was fixed, for the red candidates to make speeches from. Custom-house flags were carried in the red parades, and hung out of public-houses in the red interest, and a Custom-house ensign was suspended from the top-mast in front of the red candidates' lodgings. *The Greyhound was laid in the Humber, about two miles from Grimsby, to receive such of the blue party as could be made intoxicated, and kidnapped on board her; and two of them were actually confined there until the election was over.* Are such things tolerated by government."—This letter, with the exception of the passage in italics, was published in the Globe of the 6th of August last. A similar letter, with that passage included, was published in the Courier on the 20th of the same month. There was, however, no evidence to connect the defendant with the publication in the Courier.—Mr. Gorton, the editor of the Globe,

proved the receipt of the letter from the defendant, and stated, that he struck out the passage above alluded to. It was admitted, that the communication to Mr. Gorton was, in point of law, a publication, for which the defendant was answerable.—There was a plea of justification to the whole of the libel.

To prove the truth of the libel, the defendant called,

Charles Wood, esq., private secretary to earl Grey, who was one of the candidates in the blue interest, and who stated, that he saw the sailors at the election, with the plaintiff along with them in an undress naval uniform; the plaintiff wore a red riband, and the sailors carried Custom-house flags; the blues had a procession on the evening before the election; some guns were fired from one of the cutters, and then a row and fight commenced, and the part of the procession immediately behind him (the blues) was driven forward by a crowd of men, most of whom were sailors; he observed several muskets at the door of captain Harris's lodgings, on the morning of the day before the election, when both parties walked in procession, and the row took place; his carriage was in the procession, but he himself was not in it.—Thomas Plaskett, the harbour-master of Grimsby, stated, that he saw the plaintiff with parts of the crew of the Greyhound and Lapwing in the procession of the red candidates. He also saw two men erecting a top-mast for the purpose of hoisting a red ensign. The top-mast, with the ensign, remained during the election. A booth was also erected in front of captain Harris's lodgings, near the top-



mast. There were many Custom-house flags in the procession of the red party. One of them was hung out at the Royal Oak, a public-house in the red interest. On the Friday before the election, the Lapwing was dressed out in colours. The red party had a procession, and, when they came opposite to the Lapwing, guns were fired, and then a row commenced. The blue party were driven forward by the red.—A man, who looked after the arms on board the Greyhound, stated, that, by order of the plaintiff, he sent four brass blunderbusses, and one brass musket on shore at the time of the election, and also some flags and ensigns. He also sent a half top-sail on shore. He got these things back again after the election, and he knew that the arms had been used, as they were foul, and one of the guns was burst.—Robert Hurd, a seaman of the Lapwing, saw the plaintiff on shore at the time of the election; the plaintiff once desired the sailors to go about town and search the carriages, and prevent the blues from running away with the reds. The blues attacked the red party first, but the reds beat them off; the plaintiff did not excite them to a riot, but he sent a watch to the toll-bar to prevent the reds from being kidnapped by the blues.—A voter of Grimsby, named Beaumont, saw plaintiff in the row waving his cane, and endeavouring to put the blues to the rout; captain Harris, the red candidate, seized the reins of the horses of Mr. Wood's carriage, and stopped it, and the sailors opened the carriage, and threatened to throw Mr. Wood's friends, who were in it, into the river.—Another voter stated, that the reds changed their

line of march, in order to meet the blues. The sailors fired some guns, and then the fight commenced; plaintiff ran past the witness with some sailors, and plaintiff was calling out to them, "Come on, my lads," and they rushed together into the fight about Mr. Wood's carriage; after that fight was over, plaintiff and the sailors ran into another fight which was going on behind.—Charles Martin was one of the musical band of the blue party; he saw the plaintiff leading a party of sailors to the attack of the blues; plaintiff asked one of the sailors, where the captain—meaning captain Harris—was? the sailor answered, "Right-a-head," and the plaintiff then said, "Let's be resolute, and follow him," and they set off at a jog trot. The sailors had sticks in their hands.—Edward Billing heard the plaintiff addressing the sailors previous to the row. He said, "At them, or after them, my lads."—Another witness stated, that he saw the plaintiff heading a party of sailors, who were rushing furiously in pursuit of the blues, and plaintiff called out to the sailors, "Douse them, or down with them, my lads."—John Macgregor, a seaman on board the Greyhound, received orders from the plaintiff to take David Snow, a freeman, in the interest of the blues, on board the Greyhound. The order was given in the day-time, and at night he went in a boat to the shore, and Snow was brought down by a party of men and put into the boat, and witness put him on board the Greyhound; Snow was drunk at the time.—Samuel Clerk, second mate of the Greyhound, saw Snow on board; he also saw Wallis, another freeman, brought on board at four



o'clock on Saturday morning, which was the day of the election; Wallis was very drunk at the time.—The Attorney-general called, in reply, David Snow, who stated, that he had at first promised to vote blue, but afterwards "he did not like it." The reason of his being taken on board the Greyhound was, that he was going to vote for the blues. He might have gone on shore again, if he had thought proper. An offer was made to him for that purpose by the plaintiff's servant (Bailey), on the Saturday, but he preferred remaining on board.—Cross-examined by sir J. Scarlett. He was very drunk when taken on board, and was drunk afterwards during part of every day that he remained on board. He could not tell who made him drunk. He got very good fare on board, and thought he was as well there as any where else. There was a man to take care of him. Bailey wished him to go and vote red, but he did not wish to return on shore at all, as he was quite comfortable while he remained on board.—Mr. Denby, an auctioneer, stated, that Snow had been in his service. He had promised his vote for the reds, but witness was afraid he would be kidnapped by the blues, as he had been at a former election, and he therefore requested the plaintiff to let him be sent on board the cutter. The plaintiff said he would consider of it.—Captain Harris and colonel Challoner, the red candidates, stated, that they and the plaintiff did every thing in their power to prevent disturbance, though the attack was commenced by the blue party. These and several other witnesses went into long details in contradiction to the testimony of the defendant's wit-

nesses.—Lord Tenterden, [in summing up, observed that there were two questions for the jury—first, whether the plaintiff had actually led on the sailors to a riot and affray, "with a view to intimidate the peaceable inhabitants and the blue party;" secondly, whether the Greyhound revenue cutter had been brought into the Humber to receive such of the blue party as could be made intoxicated and kidnapped on board her, and whether two of them were actually confined there.—The Jury, after conferring together for about twenty minutes, found a verdict for the plaintiff—*Damages, 10l.*

27. MURDER.—COUNTY CLARE. SPECIAL COMMISSION. — Patrick Connors and John Cullinane were put to the bar, charged with the murder of William Blood, of Applevale, in the county of Clare, on the 21st day of January, by inflicting a gun-shot wound on the right side of his head; they were also indicted for having aided and assisted John Burke in shooting at the said William Blood. There were several other counts in the indictments.—Connor Callaghan sworn; I had been the last three or four months with Mr. Vokes, in Limerick; I knew Mr. Blood, who is dead; I was in his service minding horses and cows. In January last there were living in his house, Patrick Connors, who was butler, Nancy Lyons, Kitty Canowles, and myself. John O'Neill was there the night Mr. Blood was killed; O'Neill is since dead. Mr. Blood was killed on a Friday night. The witness here looked round twice towards the dock, for the purpose of identifying Connors, and said he did not see him. I never was examined before in a court.



On the Tuesday night before, I had conversation with Connors in the stable; he told me it would be a good plan to kill Mr. Blood, and that I should get more than three years' wages if I would keep the secret; I told him I would. I was not four weeks with Mr. Blood. Connors said, the first time Mr. Blood would go out he would call men to kill him. On Friday morning, Pat. Connors went to Corrofin, which is about a mile from the house, to get clothes, which he got the Thursday before from the master, re-made; he rode the master's horse to the forge; he was away until evening. When he returned, I was near a rick of hay in the haggard, and he told me they were to come to-night; I was not to speak a word about it. This was about night-fall: he went into the house, and I went to settle the cows. Connors was after dinner again in the stable; we were both making up the horses; he told me he would bid them put the sheep-crib that was in the grove up to the back of the wall, that it might not be known how they came in; he would open the gate for them himself, and put a stone to the gate; and he would show them where the master himself was in the parlour, before he could go up to his arms. He told me to take John O'Neill up with me when I went in, and when I heard the least noise to begin to cry in order to frighten O'Neill. I went up to bed and undressed, and so did O'Neill; afterwards Nancy Lyons came up, and said that robbers had entered through the kitchen. A little while after I heard a man desire to shoot the master, when Nancy Collins came up. I staid in bed until I heard blows, when I got up and went to the window which

looked into the yard; I saw the master, and four men hitting him; Connors was near them; he had nothing in his hand; I did not see a candle with him; it was on the same spot the body was found. The room in which I slept is over the kitchen. I am sure it was Connors I saw; he had a short striped cotton jacket on; it was the same jacket he had on in the evening; I came down soon after one o'clock. When I came into the kitchen, John O'Neill and Nancy Lyons were with me, and I saw Pat. Connors trod near the grate. Before the murder, Connors said he would make them tie him, so that he might not be suspected; he was tied with carriage or gig reins; his arms were tied to his body, and he was stretched on his side not fastened to any thing. Next morning Connors and I went up to Mr. Blood's of Rockstown; he told me not to be afraid, it would never be found out; and I would get my share of the money, as well as those who killed. I never got any. I was a Whiteboy; I was sworn a year and a half ago; Connors knew I was one, and I knew he was another.—Cross-examined; I was a faithful servant of Mr. Blood's. I knew the Tuesday before, that he was to be murdered, and did not tell; I was afraid. I was sworn on the inquest; it was a lie I swore. I took an oath when a Whiteboy; I swore not to tell what I was told; I broke the oath of my own accord; by force I took it; I was afraid not to take it.—Thomas Sheehan sworn; I remember the night Mr. Blood was killed; the night before, I was at the church of Ragh; I met the prisoner, John Cullinane, there; I know Pat. Connors; we were met to throw down



some of Mr. Synge's school-houses, and to beat those who sent scholars to his schools. John Cullinane and others put an oath to me to be next night at George Casey's house. After night-fall I went there; Casey gave me a whisper to run out over the garden after him. We went to the nursery near Mr. Blood's; when I got there Cullinane and six others were there; five of them had between them four guns and a blunderbuss. Cullinane and the rest swore me not to tell what I was going to do whilst I lived; they said they would divide what they got, and swore not to drink more than two glasses of whisky or half a gallon of punch at a time in Corrofin for the next six months, that no money might be seen on them. Pat. Connors came out and said, "welcome, boys, you are long away; I was out here before." He then shook hands with every one. "Who is this boy?" said he, meaning me. "That is a good boy," said Cullinane; he shook hands with me; he said he would go in to put in bed the men inside, and would come out soon. I was desired to watch the police. The party took off their shoes on the road, and left them near the wall. Shortly after the party went in, I heard a shot in the house, and saw Mr. Blood running out into the yard through the kitchen-door. John Cullinane and Bourk were after him. There were four striking him with guns. Pat. Connors was in the door holding a candle out to them. They had light enough without it. Connors was in the door. Cullinane struck him first. Mr. Blood said, "what do you want, boys?" He fell, but he got up in spite of them, and knocked one of them down. That was the boy that gave it to him.

George Casey, at the end, got a big stone, and threw it on his head. They broke three guns. They had the barrels and stocks going home with in their hands. He struck Brody in the breast and arm with a candlestick, or something, and hurt him severely. Casey brought Brody out near the wall, and he recovered. They afterwards went into the house to rob it.—Cross-examined; I never was concerned in a robbery; this was my first offence. I was sworn a Terry Alt man three weeks before. I was at Keefe's robbery. It was after the murder. Did you hear it was intended to murder Mr. Synge before he was fired at? I did; I know where it was attempted, and was very near it that day. I heard it was intended to murder Parson Whitty. I heard it was intended to murder Mr. Francis Macnamara. I was asked to do it, but refused.—Nancy Lyons sworn; I knew Mr. Blood; was in his service four years. I know Pat. Connors, who lived in his service, and also John Cullinane. I looked out of the window with Connor Callaghan, when Mr. Blood was killing in the yard; saw Pat. Connors there. I do not know if he had a candle. I did not see Cullinane there, but I saw him in the house when the men first came in.—The prisoners, in their defence, called some persons who gave them a good character.—The Jury retired for a few minutes, and brought in a verdict of *Guilty*.—After the announcement of the verdict, Connors made a solemn declaration of his innocence.—Judge Moore, after an impressive address, sentenced the prisoners to be hanged at the common place of execution, and their bodies to be given for dissection.



## JULY.

2. ATTEMPT AT MURDER AND SUICIDE. — At half past ten at night, a young woman named Hannah Blythe, having gone out to make purchases in company with her acknowledged suitor, a young man named Fallows, as they went up the Minories, the young woman was accosted by a man in the street, who inquired, "Is that you, Hannah?"—On her replying in the affirmative, he immediately fired a pistol, the contents of which lodged in the legs of her companion. They ran across the street to escape, but by the time they had reached the opposite pavement another pistol was discharged, the contents of which lodged in the back part of the young woman's neck. She lay weltering in her blood on the pavement and cried, "Moseley has done it;" and on Fallows turning round, he perceived a young man of that name standing at a short distance. The persons in the street, supposing Fallows, who was in the act of raising the female from the ground, to be the assassin, conveyed him to the watch-house, and Moseley was allowed to escape. The remnants of both pistols were found scattered in all directions—such had been the strength and power of the charges, that the barrels, as well as stocks, of both pistols were blown into a dozen pieces. The police being satisfied of the innocence of Fallows, he was liberated at four o'clock the following morning, and every possible exertion made to discover the retreat of the real offender. Nothing, however, was heard of him until Monday night, when Mr. Redfern, of the Public-office, re-

ceived a communication from Darlaston, stating that a young man, answering to the description of Moseley, had been found dead (evidently shot), in that neighbourhood, and then lay at the workhouse. Moseley's sister, in company with a friend, immediately proceeded to Darlaston, and identified the body as that of her brother. It appears that, on quitting the Minories, he went into the neighbourhood of Bilston, and early the following morning entered a retail brewery, kept by a man named Lowe, at Cock Heath, near that place. There he remained during the whole of Sunday, apparently labouring under great depression of spirits. At a late hour in the evening he ordered tea, but while it was preparing, suddenly left the house, and never again returned. The following morning, two boatmen, proceeding along the Walsall arm of the Birmingham Canal, observed a human body lying on the bank, partly immersed in the water. On taking it out, the head appeared to have been severely wounded by a shot; and on tracing footsteps in the neighbourhood, two pocket pistols, one loaded, the other discharged, were found at about 300 yards distance. The unfortunate man, after having attempted self-destruction, had apparently staggered to the bank of the canal, and then, either intentionally, or accidentally, from exhaustion, pitched himself into the water. Jealousy was supposed to be the motive.

4. BLASPHEMY.—SURREY SESSIONS. — TRIAL OF THE REV. ROBERT TAYLOR.—The Rev. Robert Taylor was indicted for blasphemy, to which he pleaded Not Guilty.—Joseph Stevens, a shorthand writer, was examined and



his evidence went to prove that he was present at the Rotunda on last Good-Friday, and also on Easter-Sunday, on each of which occasions he heard the defendant address the auditory, and took a verbatim account of what he said. The witness described that portion of the Rotunda from which the defendant spoke as decorated with the paraphernalia used in the ceremony of the holy sacrament. The business of the evening commenced by a young man who read an extract from *Volney's Ruin of Empires*, which he gave out as the first lesson for that evening's service, and after reading extracts from the above work for half an hour, his place on the platform was taken by the defendant, who, dressed in the canonicals of a bishop, stood forward, and was loudly greeted by his audience. He then bowed to the persons present, and turning to a cross which was suspended over the platform, he also made an obeisance; then placing his hands over his eyes he affected to be in silent adoration. In pronouncing the word "holy," the defendant repeated it several times in an ironical manner, which elicited great laughter from the audience. The witness then proceeded to read from his shorthand notes those portions of the defendant's discourses which formed the grounds of the present indictment. — Another witness, named Smith, who also took notes of the discourses delivered by the defendant at the Rotunda was examined, and his evidence was confirmatory of the preceding witness. — This witness was cross-examined by the defendant, who endeavoured to impress upon the minds of the Court and Jury that he cast no ridicule on the Deity in any of

the discourses he had delivered; that, so far from that being the case, he had delivered all those passages which he quoted from the Bible with great pathos, and only intended to throw into ridicule and contempt those passages which were introduced as counts in the indictment against him, and which he disclaimed being the author of. — The defendant read a written defence which occupied nearly five hours, and deprecated in strong language the conduct of the Society for the Suppression of Vice, which had instituted the present proceedings against him. The society consisted chiefly of the clergy, who were determined, if they could, to crush him to the earth. They were, he said, a set of priests who were unable to controvert the tenets which he promulgated, and, as an instance of their ignorance, they were afraid to come forward and enter into theological discussion with him, he having given a public challenge to the whole of the priests, and had that challenge placarded at the different colleges in this country, as well as on the continent. Persons had endeavoured to throw obloquy on him, to traduce his character, and had given him the nick-name of the Devil's Chaplain, a name which was calculated to impress people with the notion that he was either the Devil himself, or some emissary of his. He had no more to do with his Satanic Majesty than other people; but the name, which was caught at at once by the newspapers, plainly indicated the spirit of malevolence which existed against him. He denied that his discourse was calculated to revile the Christian religion, and he declared that he had as high a veneration for the beau-



tiful and pathetic language of the Scriptures as any man upon the face of the earth. He concluded by trusting that the Jury, by their verdict, would pronounce an acquittal, which he was entitled to, not one of the counts in the indictment having been sustained.—The Jury brought in a verdict of *Guilty*; and the Court sentenced the defendant to be imprisoned two years in the county gaol, to pay a fine of 200*l.*, and enter into his own recognizance in the sum of 500*l.* for his good behaviour, and find two sureties of 250*l.*, for the next five years.

6. SUICIDE IN MAIDSTONE GAOL.—Two cases of suicide occurred at the County Prison, Maidstone, on Wednesday the 6th. A woman named Ann Saywell, who was imprisoned for debt, rose as usual, and took her breakfast with the other females who were in the same apartment, and afterwards went up stairs into the bed-room. One of her companions having occasion to go up stairs in about a quarter of an hour, found her suspended from the hasp of the window by two silk handkerchiefs, which were tied together. Assistance was instantly procured, but life was quite extinct. The second case was that of a man named James Waller. He was a carpenter by trade, and was possessed of considerable property in houses and cottages, but having some money left him a short time since, from that period he led an idle dissolute life, and was committed to prison on a charge of stealing a watch from a beer-shop. He was locked up in his sleeping ward, as usual on the night of the 6th, and, on the turnkey entering the next morning, he found him hanging by a small piece of rope, fastened

to the hook of the window shutter. All attempts to restore animation were useless. An inquest was held, when a verdict was returned, in both cases, of *Temporary Derangement*.

7. SEDITION.—GUILDHALL.—*The King v. Cobbett*.—This was an indictment against William Cobbett, charging him with the publication, on the 11th of December last, of a libel, with intent to raise discontent in the minds of the labourers in husbandry, and to incite them to acts of violence, and to destroy corn, machinery, and other property. The defendant had pleaded that he was not guilty. When he entered the Court, attended by his sons, his attorney, and two friends, some persons in the gallery immediately greeted him by clapping their hands, and, on his proceeding to take his seat, they gave three loud huzzas. The defendant seemed highly gratified, and turning round and looking towards the gallery, said, “If truth prevails, we shall beat them.” The Attorney-general stated the case for the Crown, advertg to the system of riot, fire-raising, and breaking of machinery which had spread destruction through so many counties, in the end of the last, and the beginning of the present year. It was at this particular time, when special commissions were issued for the investigation of crimes of this description, that the defendant published the number of the *Weekly Political Register*, on which the indictment was founded. The paper was ushered in with a heading taken from another paper by the same author, published on the 20th of October, 1815, in the following terms:—“At last it will come to a question of actual star-



vation, or fighting for food ; and when it comes to that point, I know that Englishmen will never lie down and die by hundreds by the way side." Following up the idea in the motto, there was a paper called the Rural War, as if those unhappy persons were banded together to commit acts of violence, like troops carrying on a war, against those who withheld from them provisions. Then the "Special Commissions" came as the next general title, and a letter appeared, addressed to those very people who were likely to be called upon to take their trials for the offences with which they were charged. The first paragraph related to the special commissions ; then there was an observation about some clergyman who had written a paper which had given great offence to Mr. Cobbett. Mr. Cobbett made some severe remarks, not only upon the conduct of the clergyman who published that paper, but on the conduct of clergymen in general. He also made some strong observations upon the title to tithes, with which it was not necessary for him (the Attorney-general) to trouble the Jury. The particular paragraph to which he was bound to allude, as seditious was the following.— "In the meanwhile, however, the parsons are reducing their tithes with a tolerable degree of alacrity ! It seems to come from them like drops of blood from the heart ; but it comes, and must all come now, or England will never again know even the appearance of peace. 'Out of evil comes good.' We are not indeed upon that mere maxim 'to do evil that good may come from it.' But without entering at present into the motives of the working people, it is unquestionable that

their acts have produced good, and great good too. They have been always told, and they were told now, and by the very parson that I have quoted above, that their acts of violence, and particularly their burnings, can do them no good, but add to their wants by destroying the food that they would have to eat. Alas ! they know better ; they know that one thrashing machine takes wages from ten men ; and they also know that they should have none of this food, and that potatoes and salt do not burn ! Therefore, this argument is not worth a straw. Besides, they see and feel that the good comes, and comes instantly too. They see that they get some bread in consequence of the destruction of part of the corn ; and while they see this, you attempt in vain to persuade them that that which they have done is wrong. And as to one effect, that of making the parsons reduce their tithes, it is hailed as a good by ninety-nine hundredths even of men of considerable property ; while there is not a single man in the country, who does not clearly trace the reduction to the acts of the labourers, and especially to the fires ; for it is the terror of these, and not the bodily force, that has prevailed. To attempt to persuade either farmers or labourers that the tithes do not do them any harm, is to combat plain common sense. They must know, and they do know, that whatever is received by the parson is just so much taken from them, except that part which he may lay out for productive labour in the parish ; and that is a mere trifle compared with what he gives to the East and West Indies, to the wine countries, to the footmen, and to other unproductive



labourers. In short, the tithe-owners take away from the agricultural parishes a tenth part of the gross produce, which, in this present state of abuse of the institution, they apply to purposes not only not beneficial, but generally mischievous to the people of those parishes." In another passage, the defendant expressed his opinion that the criminals ought not to be made to suffer for any thing they had done; and speaking of the probability of some of them losing their lives, this language was used,—“No; this will not be done. The course of these ill-used men has been so free from ferocity, so free from any thing like bloody-mindedness! they have not been cruel even to their most savage and insolent persecutors. The most violent thing that they have done to any person has not amounted to an attempt on the life or limb of the party; and in no case but in self-defence, except in the cases of the two hired overseers in Sussex, whom they merely trundled out of the carts which those hirelings had had constructed for them to draw like cattle. Had they been bloody, had they been cruel, then it would have been another matter; had they burnt people in their beds, which they might so easily have done; had they beaten people wantonly, which has always been in their power; had they done any of these things, then there would have been some plea for severity. But they have been guilty of none of these things; they have done desperate things, but they were driven to desperation: all men, except the infamous stock-jobbing race, say, and loudly say, that their object is just; that they ought to have that which they are striving for; and all men,

VOL. LXXIII.

except that same hellish crew, say that they had no other means of obtaining it." — The Attorney-general said, after reading these passages, that he should think it a waste of time if he pursued the argument further. He could not conceive that there could be a doubt in any reasonable unbiassed mind, that there was a tendency not to be mistaken,—an inference of an intention not to be resisted,—with regard to the conduct which these persons were taught to pursue, by a reference to the success of those offences which they had committed. What was the tendency of all these things? to excite a suffering people, but at all events a people whose minds were inflamed, to a repetition of crime.

The publication having been proved, Mr. Cobbett addressed the Jury in a long speech, arguing against the criminal intent and tendency imputed, in the indictment, to the publication, but principally employing himself in abusing the government which had prosecuted him, and more especially the Attorney-general. He referred to the language which had been held regarding him in parliament, and complained that his trial had been going on there since the beginning of the Session, one member after another “falsely, maliciously, and scandalously” imputing to him, his lectures and publications, the crimes which had been committed in the agricultural counties. He next fell foul of “the vast affection which our present Whig government entertain for the liberty of the press. They never proceeded by information! O no; and then their Attorney-general, Sir Thomas Denman, he also had a particular affection for the liberty of the press. O yes, Denman was

H



an honest fellow, and would not, on any account, touch the liberty of the press. Yet it so happened, that this Whig government, with their Whig Attorney-general had carried on more state prosecutions during the seven months that they had been in office than their Tory predecessors in seven years. The Tories—the haughty and insulting Tories—shewed their teeth, to be sure, but they did not venture to bite. Not so with Whigs. If they should happen to remain in office a twelvemonth, all the gaols in the kingdom must be enlarged, for they would not contain room enough for the victims of this Whig government. The government itself, he maintained, and its organs were now the most atrocious of all libellers. Their newspapers libelled right and left—but libelled on their own side, and therefore were allowed to libel with impunity. He referred to the abuse which the Times, for instance, was every day pouring on the House of Commons, not only with the tendency, but with the loudly proclaimed purpose of bringing that branch of the legislature into utter horror and contempt. Did Sir Thomas Denman prosecute? No—no. That was on his side—and instead of prosecuting, when Sir R. Inglis brought the Times before the House, he maintained that the libel was true, and should be passed over. Not even the Judges had escaped. Not two months before, the Times put forth, that Mr. William Brougham, a candidate for Southwark, said to the electors, in regard to the Reform Bill, “Among the devices to defeat the measures of ministers a canvass is going on by Judges of the land, who have degraded themselves and their station.” This

was pretty well, coming from a brother of the lord chancellor, the first judge in the country. Then came the Times—a paper in close connection with the government, and, after stating that the dignified neutrality which the judges had observed since the last days of Charles were now at an end, added, “these judges expect a reformed parliament to ask, why they should receive 5,500*l.* a-year each, these hard times,” thus imputing to those learned personages the basest motives. Next day came the Courier, the heir-loom of all administrations, saying that there had been a total disregard of decency on the part of the judges; that such men were not fit to preside on trials of a political nature; and then they asked, “What chance has a reformer, if tried before one of these judges? How is he to expect a fair trial? We almost wish that the judges did not hold their office for life?” Then came on the Morning Chronicle, stating, that the conduct of Mr. Justice Parke, who was one of the judges who had acted so shamefully, was to be made the subject of some parliamentary proceeding, perhaps even some motion for an impeachment. As the Attorney-general had taken no notice of the observations upon the judges—as he had left them to defend themselves, to puff off themselves, and to pay for newspaper paragraphs if they pleased—he ought not to have called upon him to answer for what he had published. There was a person who had written, “Down with kings, lords, and priests.” That person entitled his paper The Republican, and his advice to the people was, to put down kings, lords, and priests. The Attorney-general had said in Parliament, that he thought it better



to leave such things to the good sense of the people. Then why did he not leave his publication to the good sense of the people? Was this partial selection to be endured? Would the jury allow themselves to be degraded into the mean tools of such foul play? The Attorney-general himself might recollect the circumstance of a person, who was never a hundred miles distant from sir Thomas Denman, comparing the late king to Nero, and calling the present king "a royal slanderer." But all these things were nothing; you might publish as many libels as you chose, but only don't touch the faction. "That is my whole offence. For years I have been labouring to lop off useless places and pensions, and that touches the faction. These Whigs, who have been out of office for five-and-twenty years—these lank Whigs—lank and merciless as a hungry wolf—are now filling their purses with the public money, and I must be crushed, and to-day, gentlemen, they will crush me, unless you stand between me and them." In regard to the tendency of the publication, the indictment, he said, charged, that he published, contriving and intending to incite the labourers in husbandry to outrages—to various acts of violence, by the breaking of machinery and setting fires. Now the jury must be satisfied, not from what was set out in this indictment, containing as it did garbled extracts, but they must be satisfied from the whole context—from the whole scope and tenour of the article—that the intention was that which the indictment charged it to be, before they could find a verdict of guilty. They had a right to look, not only to what was stated in other parts of the publication, but even to other

writings of his. The Attorney-general knew this—somebody had taught him law enough to know, that, if he set forth in the indictment the whole of the publication, he would at once burn his fingers. The jury must be satisfied that he (the defendant) put forth this publication for the purpose of inciting the labourers to do that which was charged in this indictment; that was, "to set fire to ricks, to pull down houses, to break machinery, and to commit outrages."—The defendant then proceeded to comment on the article, and to read several other passages which had not been set out in the indictment, and he argued that the tendency of the whole article was the reverse of that which had been ascribed to it by the Attorney-general, and which the partial extracts might lead some person to suppose. He said in one passage, that "out of evil came good." But was that evil? But he had also said, that he did not wish people to do evil that good might come from it. Having cautioned them against coming to any such conclusion, he went on to say, that the outrages had done good, and he gave his reasons for that; but it did not follow, because he thought that good had arisen, that he approved of the evil; much less, that he intended to incite the people to commit the evil, when he said just the contrary. Would the jury find a false perfidious Whig, who would not tell them that the Revolution was a glorious revolution, and yet it was the overturning of a king, and the downfall of his dynasty? A flash of lightning which set fire to a barn or a rick might do much good. This trial would do a great deal of good; it had done a great deal already, as it had enabled him,



in the presence and hearing of this great audience to cast off those vile slanders which had been circulated against him. In one of the articles, there was a petition to parliament signed by himself. The jury would take that petition and read it, for they were bound to take the whole publication together, and judge of its effects accordingly. In that petition he stated the case of the wretched labourers, their sufferings, and the causes of those sufferings. In that petition he had defended the farmers, and showed it was not they who were in fault. How, then, could it be the tendency of the publication to stir up the labourers to destroy the property of the farmers, when it shewed that it was not they who had caused the distress? Nay, it even referred to lord Melbourne's circular, a document of a conciliatory nature, and the only one of that character which had emanated from the Whigs; it had referred to that circular to show the labourers that they need not despair, as the government sympathised with their sufferings, and directed its attention to the causes of them, yet now it was contended that his object was to incite them to acts of violence. He now came, he said, to the great and obvious object of the article, and he would put it to the jury, when they should have carefully read it all through, whether they could entertain the slightest doubt that his object was, to save the lives of those who were convicted under the special commission. When that commission went out, he anticipated great shedding of blood, and he therefore felt himself called upon to endeavour to prevent it. Now let the jury read the article in question, from beginning to end, and say, whether they could possi-

bly come to any other conclusion, than that it was written for the express purpose of preventing blood from being shed. Let that fact, then, be borne in mind. Now, the object being to save the lives of these unfortunate men, was it possible to suppose that he would incite them to acts of outrage, which would, of course, be the means of defeating his object? He repeated, that his only object was, to save their lives, and for that purpose he had availed himself of the licence allowed by Paley, and had had recourse to every means in his power to accomplish his object; he had invited all parts of the country, the parishes of the metropolis, to petition on this behalf. Such was his object; such the tendency of the article for which this foul, malicious, scandalous, and wicked indictment had been preferred against him. The defendant here read over various parts of the publication containing the alleged libel, and again put it to the jury whether it was possible to come to any other conclusion, than that his object in publishing it was what he now stated; and if so, then he was perfectly satisfied that they would pronounce him not guilty, although he admitted that, in so doing, they would, at the same time, be pronouncing a verdict of guilty on this Whig government. He referred to his other publications, such as *Rural Economy*, to show that he was an encourager of the solid and peaceful comforts of the labourer, not an instigator to crimes; and told the jury that he would give them, to that effect, the evidence of no less a man than the lord chancellor of this very Whig government. In the year 1816, he had published a letter to the *Luddites* in Nottinghamshire. To-



wards the close of the last year, the lord chancellor applied to him for leave to re-publish that letter, in a work called the Library of Useful Knowledge, in order that it might be circulated amongst the very labourers whom he (the defendant) was now charged with inciting to acts of violence. What times were these! Would the lord chancellor come to Cobbett's sedition shop to get something wherewith to quiet the labourers! Nay, the Attorney-general himself was another member of the same society that wished to publish his letter. When the lord chancellor made the application, he asked, at the same time, on what terms I would consent to the republication. Now I disliked the use of the word "terms," but replied, I would consent to its being republished only on this condition, that it should be published altogether, and not garbled by extracting any portions of it, because I would not allow those parts which set forth the rights of the labourer to be left out, whilst all that was calculated to throw censure upon the violence which their wrongs had goaded them on to commit, should go forth to the world. Upon this condition I gave my consent to the republication, and lent him a copy of the book. By so doing, the learned judge will tell you I republished the letter. I do not know what the lord chancellor did with it, but I shall ask him by-and-by, as I intend to put him into the box. What, then, has the lord chancellor done? As an author, he takes my book to republish; as lord chancellor, he applies to his colleague, with whom "he had stood together in their chivalry," to institute a proceeding against me, to punish me as the author of

a libel, calculated to excite the labourers to outrage and disorder. Here, then, is the lord chancellor in November borrowing my book, in the next month prosecuting me for libel, and as a false, malicious, and seditious person, to be robbed of property, and of life, too, if the Whigs were to have the power of causing it. I have lived twenty-one years under a Tory administration, and under six Tory Attorney-generals, but have never been prosecuted, although, if the present were considered a libel, I have written plenty of a similar description. The country had been ruled with rods by the Tories, but the Whigs scourged them with scorpions." The defendant concluded by declaring, that, whatever might be the verdict of the jury, if he were doomed to spend his last breath in a dungeon, he would pray to God to bless his country; he would curse the Whigs, and leave his revenge to his children and the labourers of England. [Mr. Cobbett sat down amidst loud demonstrations of applause by numerous persons, which the officers with difficulty suppressed.]

Mr. Cobbett. I will thank your lordship to let Henry Brougham be called.—Lord Brougham then entered the court from the judges' private room, and was sworn by the officer of the court.—Mr. Cobbett. Does your lordship recollect ever applying to me for a copy of my letter, addressed to the Ludites, against the breaking of machinery? — Lord Brougham. I recollect making some application, I believe, through the secretary to a society to which I belong, for a copy of a paper written by you some years ago, the date of which we could not recollect, and also applying for



permission to make use of it by republication. I have no recollection of the mode of application ; it is possible I applied through the medium of your son. I think I had some intercourse with your son, respecting his admission to Lincoln's-inn. [A letter was handed to his lordship, who admitted it to be in his hand-writing. It was read as follows : — " Dear Sir ; though I could not attend myself at the bench when you were called, being engaged in the House of Lords, I took care all should be done correctly. I want you to ask your father about the date of a letter he has written against the breaking of machinery, as a society, with which I am connected, is working on the same grounds, and he might, perhaps, on proper terms, give us the benefit of his labour." ] — Lord Melbourne sworn. — Mr. Cobbett. Does your lordship recollect a man named Thomas Goodman, who was sentenced to suffer death ? — Witness. Yes. — Mr. Cobbett. Upon what grounds did he receive his majesty's pardon ? — The Attorney-general objected to so irregular an inquiry. — The Lord Chief Justice decided that such a question could not be put. — Mr. Cobbett said, as that was his lordship's opinion, he had no further questions to put to the witness. — Lord Radnor sworn, and examined by the defendant. Had known him upwards of thirty years, and, during that period, had been a constant reader of his writings. From what he (witness) had seen of him, and read of his works, he did not think he was a person likely to excite the working classes to outrage against their masters, or any one else, but quite the reverse. — Lord Tenterden, in summing up the case, stated, that the language

of the article in question seemed, certainly, strongly calculated to effect the purpose charged against the defendant, but that was a question exclusively for the jury. — The jury retired about a quarter past six o'clock, and, shortly afterwards, his lordship withdrew to his private room. After sending to inquire two or three times if the jury were likely to agree, and being answered in the negative, his lordship left the court at half-past nine o'clock. About one o'clock, the jury sent out several notes to their friends, apprizing them that there was no probability of their coming to a decision, and that, therefore, they need not expect them home all night. — Lord Tenterden arrived at the court at eight o'clock next morning. At a quarter past nine the jury entered the box, and were asked, whether they were agreed in their verdict ? — The Foreman of the Jury said they were not agreed, nor was it likely that they should come to a conclusion one way or the other ; two of the jury were determined one way, and it was evident they would not yield. The jury had now been locked up for fifteen hours, and many of them were so fatigued, that if they were to be locked up again, serious consequences might follow. — Lord Tenterden inquired on what ground they differed ? — The Jury intimated, that the two jurymen had declared their sentiments so strongly, that it was impossible to expect them to yield. — Lord Tenterden. Then, gentlemen, you are discharged.

9. **BURSTING OF A STEAM-BOILER.** — An accident occurred from the bursting of a steam-boiler at the works in progress at the new Custom-house, Liverpool. A new engine of five horses' power



had been erected for the purpose of hoisting and lowering the stones into their places. Several of the men in the works were assembled in the engine-house to try the strength of the new boiler, but they forgot to place the weight on the balance; and whilst they were standing round, thinking that the steam was not at its height, the boiler exploded, and blew up the whole building. One of the bystanders, the overlooker of the labourers in the works, was blown at least thirty yards from the spot, and killed instantaneously. Two other men were hurt, but not dangerously. One of them was taken to the infirmary. Such was the force of the explosion, that the bricks and other fragments of the building were forced up Pool-lane as far as King-street, a distance of about eighty yards, and on each side as far as Trafford-street and South John-street. The streets were covered with the ruins, and a great many windows in the neighbouring shops and warehouses were broken by them.

11. THUNDER-STORM.—A portion of Berkshire, Oxfordshire, and Gloucestershire, was visited by a tremendous storm of thunder and lightning, hail and rain. In the neighbourhood of Oxford, Reading, Newbury, Farringdon, Cirencester, Wantage, &c., the rain and hail did great damage to the crops; the ears of wheat were in many places cut off, and the pods stripped from the beans. At Henley, two sheep were killed; and through the whole district over which the storm passed, it was greater than was remembered on any former occasion. At Oxford, the lightning struck one of the corner pinnacles of the beautiful tower of Magdalen College, and burnt the roof of the

College near the river: part of the stone-work fell to the ground, and when taken up, it emitted a strong sulphureous smell. The house of Mr. Palmer, of Litcomb, near Wantage, was struck by lightning; his five children, two maid-servants, and Mr. John Bennett druggist, of Wantage were standing, at the moment, in a passage through which the bell wires passed, and were all struck to the ground, but without serious injury, though one of the servants' shoes was almost burnt to tinder. At Highworth, the lightning entered the roof of a cottage, shattered a bedstead, and threw a child, that the mother had just laid in bed, on the floor, but unhurt; the mother's face was scorched. Mr. Kineer's servant, of the Lee, near Cricklade, got under a tree for shelter; the tree was struck by lightning, and rent to the bottom, and he and a horse were killed. The injury to hot-houses, from the hail, was very considerable. The damage at Buscot Park, near Reading, was upwards of 150*l*.

13. THEFT BY A PREACHER.—At the York Assizes Daniel and Peter Simpson were indicted for having on the 10th of May last, feloniously stolen nine ewes, thirteen lambs and ten sheep; also, for having, on the 19th of May, stolen seven ewes, seven lambs, and seven sheep; and on the 13th of May, six ewes, eight lambs, and six sheep. To each of these indictments the prisoners pleaded *Guilty*. — The prisoner Daniel, who, up to the time of his apprehension, was a local-preacher in the Wesleyan-Methodist connexion, addressed the Court at considerable length, and said, “that he had been induced to take the sheep through distress, in the



hope, by retrieving his circumstances, of being able to satisfy his creditors." In conclusion, he said. "My Lord, I solemnly avow, not by way of justification, that I took the sheep, not with a view of enriching myself, not to gratify my own sensual appetite, as it is well known to all my neighbours that I have not been drunk for twenty years, and I never indulge in smoking a pipe. My habits are known to be economical: I took them out of the love which I bore to my creditors; and I leave myself in the hands of my Judge.—Mr. Justice Parke; Is Peter Simpson your brother?—Yes, my Lord, and was my servant.—Sentence, *Transportation for life*.

13. BURGLARY.—CAMBRIDGE.—William Smith, George Baxter, and William Markham, were capitally indicted for burglariously entering the dwelling-house of Francis Old, at Crawley, on the 26th of February, and stealing thereout sundry articles of property.—Mr. Old is a farmer residing at Crawley, with his wife, one son, and a female servant; he and his wife are nearly eighty years old, and infirm. The family had all retired to rest, on the night in question, about eight o'clock, having secured the windows and doors, and about one in the morning were alarmed by the noise of strangers in the house below. The prosecutor got up, and went down stairs into the kitchen, when he saw three men coming towards him from the wash-house; he was immediately knocked down by one of them, and hurt considerably. It was a moonlight night, and he saw them distinctly. As soon as he got up, he seized a large brush, and felled one of the men by a violent blow on the face; but the

fellow quickly got up, and the three then beat the prosecutor severely while on the ground. They next went up stairs, where they remained ransacking the drawers, and on Mrs. Old speaking to them, they all beat her violently with bludgeons, and left her weltering in her blood. One of the men said exultingly, as they went down stairs, "D—n the old woman, I've done for her nicely!" In the mean time the servant girl had been awakened and ran to the window of her room, when she saw three other men on the outside the house watching to give alarm, had any body come up. She heard her mistress say, "God bless your souls, I have no money; pray, spare my life;" but the men swore at her, and said they would have her life, and they accompanied their oaths with several blows. As soon as the girl opened the window, she heard one of the men in the garden cry to the others, "D—n it, Bob, come along, you fool, here's assistance coming." They then asked her what she wanted with them; when she drew back and shut the window, and immediately she heard a gun, as she imagined, fired at her, and her window was broken at the same time. Baxter was recognised as one of the men in the garden. Markham and Smith were in the house, the former having a black crape mask on his face. They all three retired into a back part of the garden, where they divided a drawer of silver and copper amongst themselves; and a drawer of silver and copper was stolen from the bed-room of the prosecutor. It was further proved, that the three prisoners and three other persons were drinking in company together at a public-house about four miles from Mr. Old's, which they left at



half-past eleven at night. On the following day, the constable went to see Markham, whom he found already in the custody of another constable. On his person were found several bills and receipts belonging to Old, which had been in his house the night before: slugs, and bolts, and a pistol, and a black crape mask, were found on him, besides a variety of articles belonging to the prosecutor, and in the house were three huge clubs, having blood and hair upon them. The constable then went in search of Smith, whom he saw entering a large wood with another man; they ran off, but Smith was overtaken. On his person a quantity of silver was found, and he had a cut on the ridge of his nose, which he said had been made by a girl whom he quarrelled with, and who threw a pint pot at him (this was probably the man whom the prosecutor struck down with the brush). His coat-cuffs and shirt-sleeves were bloody, and some blood was observed on the corners of his cravat, which were turned in. The next day the prisoner Markham sent for the chief constable, to whom he made a full and voluntary confession of his participation in the outrage. An accomplice of the name of Lee was called as a witness, and his evidence confirmed the testimony of the witnesses for the Crown, in every particular.—The Jury found them all *Guilty*.

20. IRISH BARBARITY.—ENNIS.—Timothy Reilly, a tailor, was put to the bar, on a charge of having aided and assisted in cutting out the tongues of Lynan and Thomas Doyle, on the 19th of December, at Dromally, herds of Ralph Westropp, esq.—Lynan Doyle; I lived December twelve-months, in Dro-

mally, with my brothers Thomas and Michael Doyle. I was driver and herdsman to Mr. Ralph Westropp. John Magrath was in my situation before me. Between the hours of one and two o'clock at night, I heard a noise outside the door, when, shortly, the door was kicked in and broke. I was just after lighting a wisp of straw, when my hand got a blow of a gun, and they beat me about the house, and then dragged me out on the road, bare and naked, of a frosty night, and put me on my back, and, with their thumbs, forced my tongue out and cut it from the string out (a thrill of horror pervaded the court); there were a great number there. After they cut out my tongue, they fired powder into my breast; the gentlemen of the county saw the state I was in. They then brought me in and gave me a kick, which threw me flat near the fire, where I remained bleeding. As I was coming into the house the party was dragging out my brother Thomas, who lay in one bed with me; my brother Thomas they served the same way which they did me. The party stopt some time longer, and gave us more blows; they said to me not to be here on to-morrow night, but quit the house; I said there was no occasion for them to say that, as I was sure I could not have life; I said this as well as I could. (The witness exhibited to the Court the mutilated state of his tongue). It was a bright frosty night, almost as lightsome as day.—Thomas Doyle corroborated the statement of his brother the preceding witness. He deposed, that the prisoner at the bar had come to his bedside on that night; the witness knew him by eye-sight, as he had often seen him, but was



ignorant of his name, until very recently. Prisoner said to him, "Get up, you robber, get out of bed." "Upon which he dragged me out of bed, and I was taken out to the yard, before which he gave me a blow of a stick, and cut my ear; he pulled me out at once; I had an opportunity of seeing the prisoner well. As I was going out, I met my brother coming in bleeding, upon which I fainted, and fell senseless, and knew nothing of what occurred to me until the smarting of my tongue from the cutting. My brother Michael hid himself under the bed, and is here to-day; there was scarcely an inch of my body which was not cut."—This witness underwent a long cross-examination, the drift of which went to establish his being mistaken as to the person.—Michael Doyle deposed to his having seen the prisoner from under the bed, where he lay concealed.—John Halloran deposed to the prisoner having been at Dillon's child's wake, on the night of the atrocity; the prisoner left the wake-house at ten o'clock at night, in company with M'Grath, who had been hanged for this offence.—The witness had absconded from his usual residence since this transaction.

An alibi was set up, which occupied two or three hours in investigation.—Verdict *Guilty*.—The prisoner was sentenced to be hanged, and was left for execution.

22. ATTEMPT TO POISON.—DORCHESTER.—Job Nobbs, aged 52, was charged with having, on the 9th of April last, maliciously and feloniously attempted to administer to his infant son, Philip Nobbs, a large quantity of laudanum, with intent to kill the child.—Mary Legge, deposed as follows:

—I am niece to the prisoner's wife, who died on the Monday week after last Easter. The prisoner came for me about ten days before the death of his wife, and asked me to come to his house to take care of the child which had been born on the 25th of March. On the evening of the 9th of April I made some pap of bread, with which I fed the child. After I had fed it, I put the remainder of the pap in a tea-cup, which I placed upon a shelf on the dresser. The tea-cup was quite clean, and had no smell. I then took the child up stairs, and came down again between seven and eight o'clock to feed it. The prisoner had been in between five and six o'clock, and had had his tea. When I came down between seven and eight, I took some biscuit out of the cupboard to make pap. The prisoner who was there at the time, said that there was some pap on the dresser which I might give the child. I said that it was made of bread, and that the biscuit pap was better for the child at that time. I fed the child with the biscuit pap, and took it up stairs. In the course of the evening a Mrs. Wightman came in to see the prisoner's wife. When Mrs. Wightman went up stairs the child began to cry, and Mrs. Wightman saying that the child wanted pap took him in her arms, and brought him down to the kitchen. She took down the pap from the dresser, and after smelling it, asked me whether I had put any spirits into it? I answered "No." She then asked me if I had put any laudanum into it? I said, "No, there is nothing in it as I know, Mrs. Wightman." She said, "Sure there is laudanum in it?" She did not give any of it to the child, but



took it away to her own house. She took the baby also. The prisoner did not see her then. About half-past nine o'clock she brought back the child. The prisoner was in the house when she came, and on her coming in, he asked if "that young son of a b—— was not dead yet?" He had thought that it would be dead before this time. The prisoner seemed to have had some drink, but was not drunk. I had had the care of the child for the preceding week, and had fed him every day. The prisoner had never interfered with me before in the feeding of it, nor given me any directions on the subject. — Mrs. Wightman confirmed the statements of the preceding witness so far as they related to the part which she had taken in the case. She stated further, that the prisoner came to her house at about ten o'clock of the same night. Before he came, witness had shown to her husband the pap which she had brought, and he had smelled it, and said that he thought some laudanum was mixed up with it. When the prisoner came to witness's house, witness's husband asked him if he knew how to make pap. The prisoner only answered this by asking what pap was. Witness's husband answered, "There has been some pap made for your child that had laudanum in it." She kept the pap which she had brought from the prisoner's house, until she delivered it to Mr. Fryer, the clergyman of the parish. — Mr. Fryer deposed that he sent it to Mr. Davis, of Dorchester, for examination. — Mr. Davis, the druggist, and Mr. Wallis, a druggist, as well as coroner of the county, deposed that they had both examined the pap, and found it

strongly impregnated with laudanum. It could not contain less than half a quarter of an ounce, and that quantity was sufficient to destroy life in an infant of the age of the deceased. The Jury found the prisoner *Guilty* of the charge, adding expressly, that they believed the laudanum to have been administered by the prisoner with intent to murder the infant. He was sentenced to be hanged.

23. MURDER FROM INSANITY. — BURY ST. EDMUND'S. — William Offord was indicted for the wilful murder of Thomas Chisnall, at the parish of Hadleigh, on the 16th of June, by shooting him with a gun loaded with a bullet and marble.

James Bickmore. — Went to the house of the deceased, on the 16th of June, between nine and ten o'clock in the evening, for two bushels of oats. His corn-chamber was in a passage at a little distance, and I went there, when the deceased put me up the corn, and assisted me in putting it on my shoulder, and I left him in the room. The deceased came out of the room, and when I got half-way across the yard I heard the report of a gun, and a woman cried "murder," and that "Chisnall was shot dead." The report was a few yards from me, and seemed to come from the prisoner's chamber window. I turned round and saw Chisnall lying on the ground seemingly dead; he was carried out of the yard. — Charles Cudden, constable. On the 16th of June I heard the report of a gun, and went immediately to the prisoner's house about ten o'clock. I found nobody in his sleeping-room, the shop, or pantry. Afterwards I went into the lumber-room up stairs, which communicated with



his sleeping-room. In a hutch, I found a bill-hook, a naked sword, and half-a-dozen great stones; there is a window opposite to the corn-chamber of the deceased. I then tried the door of the prisoner's sleeping-room; but it was locked, and we broke open the door. When we got in, I saw the prisoner fallen down and weltering in his blood; two razors lay close by him, and a gun which appeared to have been recently discharged, and smelt very strong of powder. The ram-rod was not in the gun. The razors were both open, and were very bloody, especially one of them, and there were two wounds in his throat, one on each side. He had no neck-cloth or coat on; the coat was on the bed. The surgeons dressed his wounds, and it was two or three hours before he came to himself. I stayed with him all night, and when the surgeons had dressed him, I asked him, "How came you to shoot Chisnall?" He said, "I don't know nothing about that." I then asked him, "How he came to cut his own throat?" He said, "Chisnall did that;" and an hour afterwards he told me he had left his watch before the fire-place, and he was afraid somebody had stolen it. I looked for it, but never could find it. This was at one o'clock. I searched his bed-room, and in a drawer I found a paper of powder, and another containing five stone marbles: the powder was not screwed up tight, but looked as if some one had opened it, and it was not full. Below stairs, in the shop, I found a bloody waist-coat, and in the pocket some papers. After finding them, I went up stairs; and the prisoner asked me if I had found any papers, and I told him I had; when he

said they were his papers, and I must give them to him; but I told him I must keep them till I had seen Mr. Wayman, the coroner. Some five or six weeks before that time the prisoner told me that Chisnall had got a warrant against him, and meant to take his life, and I (the constable) might as well serve it then. I told him I had no warrant to serve: this he said several times. In his bed-room I found the ramrod standing close by the drawers, where the powder was. On the following Saturday he asked me where his gun was, and on my telling him, he said I might as well put the ram-rod with it. The chamber window of the prisoner may be seen from the corn-chamber of the deceased, from which it is about twenty-feet distant. Cross examined.—I never had a warrant against the prisoner from Chisnall or any body else. He told me that Mr. Last, the lawyer, had a warrant against him, and meant to take away his life. I have known the prisoner several years, he talks like other people at most times, but when he told me about the warrants against his life, I fancied he was labouring under some delusion.

Mary Paine. — I have heard Chisnall and the prisoner have words together a good many times. He used bad language to Chisnall. One night, in consequence of seeing a light in Chisnall's room, the prisoner refused to go to bed. At times he seemed to me like a wild man; he worked himself into a pitch against Master Chisnall. At other times he was like other people.

William Chisnall, eldest son of the deceased.—I have heard the prisoner abuse my father a good many times, and about nine or ten months ago (the day he received



his pension), I heard him say he would do for my father. He was not wild, when he had not taken liquor.—The papers found in the prisoner's waistcoat were then read. The first was a summons, dated 1828, against the prisoner for non-payment of a poor's rate; it was endorsed, in manuscript, "Chisnall drove me from the church; this is the first step to take away my life, because I was not able to pay the rate." Another was headed, "Jan. 29, 1829,—Conspiracy began," and contained the words, "It would serve Chisnall right if some one were to give him a few good knocks on the head; I would not assist him." The third was headed, "17th April, 1830," and contained a denial of having used Chisnall's name, and said that "the parish wished to take away his life, and make a county job of it." Another contained a threat against Chisnall, and said, "he would have to die for it as well as I." The next was headed, "High conspirators against the life of William Offord," and amongst them were the names of "T. Chisnall and family."

Mr. Mudd, a surgeon, said that the deceased died of the wounds which the prisoner had inflicted. After his death one of the wounds was traced to the shoulder blade, where a marble was lodged. In the spine a leaden ball wrapped in wearing apparel, was found, and this wound had been the cause of death. There were several wounds on the throat of the prisoner; they were not deep, but they were in such a situation that had they been deep they would have been dangerous. On his cross-examination he said he should imagine that the prisoner had laboured under "monomania, or partial derange-

ment;" or, as he afterwards said, "hallucination of mind upon one subject." From the wounds on the prisoner's throat, he was of opinion that he intended to have destroyed himself—not that he made them to screen himself from the consequences of the act of which he had been guilty. The prisoner in his defence said, that "he had been sadly used for twenty-nine months; he had suffered shipwreck, and had been easier since he had been in prison, than for two years and a half before. He never could rest night or day." For the prisoner, various witnesses were examined to prove that the prisoner laboured under *monomania*.

Lord Lyndhurst then summed up the evidence. The two points for the consideration of the Jury were,—1st, whether Chisnall came to his death by the hands of the prisoner; and, 2dly, if they should be of opinion that he did, then whether the prisoner was in such a state of mind at the time as to know right from wrong; to know that it was a crime to take away the life of a fellow creature?—The Jury, after retiring for ten minutes, *acquitted* the prisoner on the grounds of insanity, and he was ordered to be detained in custody until His Majesty's pleasure should be known.

SCOTCH MARRIAGES. — CON-SISTORY COURT, *Conway, v. Beazley*. — This was a suit of nullity of marriage promoted by Emily Frances Conway, otherwise Beazley, against Mr. Samuel Beazley, the architect, under the following circumstances:—In May, 1810, Mr. Beazley married a Miss Richardson, in the parish of St. Mary Abbots, Kensington. They cohabited till 1813, when a separation took place. In 1823, Mr.



Beazley having gone down to Scotland upon business, Mrs. Beazley instituted a suit against him in the Scotch Courts for a divorce, by reason of adultery: and a sentence of divorce was pronounced by the Court of Session, which, under the Scottish law, severs the parties *a vinculo matrimonii*, and completely dissolves the marriage. Accordingly, in July, 1824, Mr. Beazley married again the promoter of this suit, at York-place Chapel, Edinburgh, Mr. Beazley's former wife, who died at Reading in December last, being then alive. The question was, whether (there being no imputation of *mala fides* or collusion), a marriage in England, under these circumstances, was, or was not, to all intents, dissoluble by a sentence of Divorce in a Scotch Court.

Dr. Lushington, after detailing the facts, said he would reject the certificate of the second marriage, which professed to have been extracted from the registry of York-place Chapel, Edinburgh, as inadmissible by the rules of the court: but the marriage was sufficiently established by the testimony of a witness. Upon the point of law, he was of opinion that there was no substantial distinction between this case and *Lolley's case*, decided by the twelve judges; but he begged it to be distinctly understood, that in pronouncing the sentence he was about to give, he did not mean to step in the slightest degree beyond the circumstances of this particular case. A number of circumstances might arise in other cases requiring the deepest deliberation of the court before the same sentence could be pronounced. To show the difficulty of applying the law in these questions, it might be suffi-

cient for him to state, that attempts had been made in Scotland to adopt the law of England, so far as to substitute the separation *a mensa et thoro* for the dissolution of marriage in the case of divorce; but that attempt had been rejected by the Court of Session. The learned Judge concluded by pronouncing a sentence of nullity.

23. RAILWAY ACCIDENTS. — As the locomotive engine on the Bolton rail-way was going up the lower inclined plane, with a heavy load of goods, it ran off the road, was overturned against the bank, and fell upon the engineer and fireman, who were killed upon the spot. Two other men were riding on the tender, one of whom was dangerously hurt, the other scalded. The engine was one with wheels of six feet diameter, a size considered objectionable by Mr. Stephenson, and not used on the Liverpool and Manchester line. A few days before, on the Liverpool and Manchester railway, the endless rope, by which goods are drawn up the great tunnel to the station at Edge-hill, broke, and a fireman employed at the stationary engine-house, incautiously went upon the wheel, round which the rope is passed, for the purpose of taking off the old rope that it might be replaced by a new one. The wheel was at the time unconnected with the engine, so that no danger was apprehended from that quarter. Unfortunately, however, on the loose end of the rope being extricated, the other end naturally became tight, and caused the wheel to revolve with considerable force, carrying the unfortunate youth along with it. At the first revolution his head was squeezed between the wheel and the frame, and was instantly crushed to atoms.



Only three days afterwards another accident happened. The engine called the Mercury, was proceeding to Manchester, with a load of merchandise, and had reached the foot of the Whiston incline. It is usual for the engines to take only half of their load up the inclined plane at once, and then return for the other half. On reaching the foot of the plane, the engineer stopped the engine, and, according to the usual practice, caused it to retrograde for a few feet, in order that the chains connecting the waggons being slackened, the first half of the train might be more easily detached from the rest. Before this was done, however, a fireman, leaned forward between the two centre waggons, and attempted to detach them, although the chains were not yet slackened. On the engine being backed, the waggons fell against each other, and the head of the unfortunate man, who was stooping very low at the time, was caught between the projecting bars of the two waggons, and crushed so dreadfully, that he expired on the spot.

25. PETERBOROUGH CATHEDRAL.—The new Choir of this Church being completely erected, the ceremony of its re-opening took place this day. The interest which it had excited in the adjacent part of the country was extreme. As soon as the doors were opened, the church was filled with not less than 3000 persons, whose eyes were gratified by the spectacle of as beautiful a choir as art ever produced. Handel's *Te Deum* was performed by Mather, the celebrated blind organist. The Communion Service was performed by the Lord Bishop of the Diocese, assisted by the Dean; and the

Sermon was preached by the Lord Bishop of Gloucester, who, having been the author, promoter, and finisher of the whole scheme, was invited to fill the new pulpit. His discourse was listened to with great attention and interest by the assembled multitude. The history of this work is somewhat singular. The old interior of the building having been destroyed, in the civil wars, by troops of Oliver Cromwell, a very mean and inappropriate choir of painted deal had occupied its place. Four years ago, a subscription was raised, in the city and neighbourhood, to erect a new organ screen, and altar screen of stone, and a choir of Norway oak, under the auspices of the late Dean, Dr. Monk, the present Bishop of Gloucester. The amount subscribed, was about 6,000*l.*; but the beauty of the workmanship exceeds what might have been expected even for that large sum; and it is the general opinion, that no church in the kingdom presents a more beautiful interior. The plans were made by Mr. Edward Blore the Architect; and the work has been executed with uncommon skill and elegance by persons who are natives of this place. A new organ-case forms part of it. After service the present Dean, the Very Rev. Dr. Turton, entertained the subscribers, together with others of the nobility, clergy, and gentry, at an elegant and sumptuous banquet; laid out with great taste in the garden of the Deanery. Nearly 300 ladies and gentlemen partook of this collation. The poor of the city shared largely in the liberality of this day.

29. SINGULAR CASE.—MURDER.—MAIDSTONE.—John Any



Bird Bell, aged 14, was charged with the murder of Richard Taylor, aged 13.—Robert Taylor, the father of the deceased, receiving an allowance from the parish, proved, that, on the 4th of March, he sent his son Richard to Aylesford, for the weekly sum. His dress was, a cap lined with flannel, a blue jacket, brown trowsers, light worsted stockings, and low shoes, a belcher handkerchief round his neck, and a pair of worsted gloves. “I gave him a bag to bring the money home in. Before he started, he asked me for my knife, to cut a bow and arrow, which I gave him. I never saw my son alive again. Not having come home at his regular time, three o’clock, I made inquiries, but heard nothing of him until the 11th of May, and, in consequence of information I received on that day, I went to Bridgewood, three miles from my house at Stroud. When I got into the wood, I saw the body of my son. I recognized it by his dress and his marks. The body was about twenty rods from the road. There was a path leading to the spot, but it was not much used. A particular mark by which I knew the body, was the mark of a bunch of currants on his breast, with which the boy was born. I afterwards saw a knife in the hands of Patterson, the constable; that knife was the knife I lent my son, and I saw a glove, which was my son’s glove.—Cross-examined. My son left my house at nine o’clock that morning. We had breakfasted before. I was then at home. The dress was buried with the body. The body was in a state of putrefaction, and greatly consumed. The features of the face were not visible, but the hair remained perfect, and worms were crawling all about it.

The eyes were not discernible; the body had not the appearance of having been under the ground. There was a blind path leading to the body, which was about a foot only from the path. The trunk of the body was perfectly sound, but the thighs and legs were consumed by worms. The only knife I saw was the knife I lent my son, and it was found in the pocket. The body was not shown to any of my friends when it was found, but several persons who knew the boy from a child saw it. My son was a very spirited little boy; though small, he would be very apt to resent an insult, and take his own part. He was not near the size of the prisoner. He was a delicate small boy, but very active. He was a boy that never would go into a wood, unless seduced there. Bows and arrows might be cut by the road side, without going into a wood. A “bender” is generally used, which might be found either by the road or in the wood.—Re-examined. The clothes were on the body when I first saw it in the wood. I had previously described all the marks on the body before the body was found. I have no doubt whatever that it was the body of my son. When found, the glove on the right hand was turned down to the wrist.

Mary Ann Taylor, sister of the deceased, a child seven years old, after answering satisfactorily as to her knowledge of the nature of an oath, stated, I went with my brother three times to Aylesford to get money. I always saw John Any Bell when I went. I recollect my brother going the day he was lost. I went with him the time before that. We went about nine o’clock. We went down



Stoney-lane to Aylesford. We went on to Aylesford, and saw Mr. Cuthbard there, and got 9s. from him; as we were coming back, we saw the prisoner and his little brother, James Bell, by the lime-kiln, as you go down the hill. The prisoner said to my brother, "I have got some sticks, come away Dick, and don't mind her." My brother said he should mind me. It was up the wood he asked my brother to go. We then went home, and John Bell, the prisoner, went part of the way with us.—In cross-examination, she said, she knew that the prisoner's father worked near the lime-kiln, where they met the prisoner. The wood is not far from that lime-kiln, but you must go round a little to get to the wood.—George Cuthbard, assistant-overseer of the parish of Aylesford. On the 4th of March, the boy, Richard Taylor, came to my house at Aylesford, about eleven o'clock; I gave him three half-crowns, one shilling, and six-pence; I put the money into the boy's bag myself; the boy was usually accompanied by a little girl, but not on that day.—Henry Lewington. I am a warrant-officer on board his majesty's ship Warrior, at Chatham; I was going, on the 4th of March last, from Rochester to Chatham, about ten o'clock in the morning; I met the boy, Richard Taylor, on the road, and walked with him part of the way towards Aylesford, and left him (the boy) going on to Aylesford. As I was returning again in the afternoon, I saw the deceased again on the road, in company with the prisoner and his brother, near the Bell public-house, but lost sight of them very soon. I heard afterwards of the loss of the deceased boy, and told his father what I had

seen of him. On the Tuesday when the boy was missing, I met the prisoner with his brother, and asked him if he knew any thing of young Taylor, and the prisoner replied that he parted with Taylor in the turnip-field, and that he saw him go towards Master Hawkes's, on the Benham-road. I recollect the 11th of May, when the body was found; I went there about one o'clock, and saw the body, which I immediately recognized. He wore a smockfrock, a blue jacket, and blue trousers, as I believe, and a south-wester cap: this was the same dress the boy wore when I met him on the 4th of March. The body had a glove on one hand, the right turned down at the wrist. The road to Hawkes's leads from the Benham-wood towards the turnpike, from the common. Bell's father, and the boys themselves, constantly worked near that spot to grub roots, and take them to sell at Rochester. On the day in question, I saw the prisoner working there, and he continued to work there until the body was found.—John Izard. On the 11th of May I went into a wood two miles from Rochester, on the left hand of the road from Rochester to Maidstone. I was going to a field beyond this wood. There was a path or track for labourers to pass, near which I found a body. It had a cap on, lined with woollen, and a blue jacket, dark trousers, and a canvass frock. The body was lying on the back, with one hand across the breast, and the other extended, with a glove made of worsted on it turned down at the wrist, and the hand partially closed. Having heard that young Taylor was lost, I went, on finding this body, and gave information to Mr. Taylor,



the father.—Edward Seaton, a surgeon, deposed to the cause of the death, and was confirmed by another medical practitioner.—Geo. Farrell examined, clerk to the magistrates at Rochester. I was present on the 21st of May, when the prisoner was before the magistrates. The prisoner then said something which I reduced to writing. There was neither threat nor promise held out to him. What he said, after it had been taken down, was read over to him, and he made his mark, and the magistrates signed it. The paper produced is the same they then signed.—An objection was made to the admission of this statement in evidence against him; but the judges, after consulting with lord Tenterden, held, that the confession, as a statement, should be received. The paper was as follows:—“John Bell, the prisoner, said to his brother James, on seeing the deceased, ‘there goes young Taylor, James, let us kill him and take his money, and let us lay him under these stones, that we can’t count over.’ He then addressed the magistrate, and said, ‘It was I, Sir, that did the murder, and, while I was doing it, my brother Jem watched at back.’ He did it, he said, at one cut; and the deceased was not long dying. The little boy lost his way in the wood, and lay down to cry; and, while the boy was lying down, he cut his throat. He took the money from the boy’s glove, and gave part to his brother. His brother gave him his knife to cut the boy’s throat. The boy squeaked, when his throat was cut, as a rabbit squeaks. He only squeaked once. He gave him two cuts. He took the boy into the wood to murder him. He had on the frock his brother Jem then

wore, and the blood went on it, and was on it still. He would not tell this, he said, but Jem told first.”—The witness said, that the brother contradicted the prisoner in a violent manner; upon which the prisoner said, “Do you mean to say, Jem, that you did not give me your knife to cut the boy’s throat; and did not you have part of the money?”—Charles Patterson, constable. I had the prisoner in my custody, and was taking him from Rochester to Maidstone gaol, and, in passing a pond, the prisoner observed, “That is the pond where I washed my hands and the knife after I did the crime;” and he remarked, on seeing a path that led to the road, “That is the road that leads to the spot where I killed the poor boy. Don’t you think, Sir, he is better off than I am?” The prisoner also showed me a place where he came out of the wood, with the bloody knife in his hand, he said, and also a place where he and the deceased went into the wood: he stated, that before that they had been together in a turnip-field, and pulled a turnip, which the deceased pared with his knife; that then he took the deceased into the wood, under the pretence of showing him a short way home; but, after they had got some distance, he told the deceased he had lost his way, and the deceased, on hearing that, sat down and began to cry, and on that he jumped on the deceased, and in an instant cut his throat. He then took the money, partly from the deceased’s hand, and partly from the purse. He had great difficulty in getting the money from the hand, it was closed so fast, and, after, getting the money, he rushed out of the wood, greatly alarmed. He said also, that he was sure, if the body



of Taylor was dug up, the knife and the glove would be found in his pocket, for he (the prisoner) saw it put there. On taking him to gaol, the prisoner said, he need not be ironed; he knew he should be hanged, and would not attempt to escape. He said he had spoken to a boy of the name of Evendon, on the road that evening, who asked him if he had passed his father's horse and cart. The body, the witness said, was dug up, after it had been buried, and the witness saw the brother of the prisoner take the knife and glove from the right hand breeches pocket of the deceased. [Here the witness produced the knife and glove, and also another knife, which he got from a boy named Henry Perrin, who had purchased it from the prisoner's brother. This last knife was the one with which the murder was committed; it was a large new clasp knife, exceedingly strong and sharp.]—John Railton, a linen-draper at Rochester, recollected the prisoner coming into his shop to ask for change of half-a-crown. This was after the boy Taylor was missing.—George Ellis. I went to meet my father on the Rochester-road, about the time Taylor was lost, but I don't recollect the month. I met the prisoner and his brother near the wood, about half a mile from where the body was found. The prisoner asked me if I had seen his brother, whom I had met just before, and I told him I had; and I asked him if he had seen my father, and he said he had.

After a few minutes consultation the Jury returned a verdict of *Guilty*, but recommended the prisoner to mercy on account of his extreme youth, and the profligate and unnatural manner in

which it appeared that he had been brought up.—The Judge proceeded to pass judgment of death on the prisoner, and held out not the slightest hope of mercy.

The prisoner was remarkably short in stature, but thick-set and strong built, with an almost infantine countenance, being of exceedingly fair complexion, rather sunburnt, and flaxen hair. During the trial he showed no marks of feeling, though the steadfast manner, in which he fixed his eyes on each witness while under examination, proved his attention to the proceedings. The hardihood which the culprit had displayed at his trial, and even when sentence was passed, deserted him as he entered his cell. He wept bitterly; and when his mother visited him on Sunday afternoon, he accused her of being the cause of bringing him into his "present scrape." On Sunday evening after the condemned sermon had been preached by the rev. chaplain, he made a full confession of his guilt. His statement did not materially differ from that which was given on the trial; but he added some particulars of the conduct of his victim before he murdered him. He said, that, when he sprung upon Taylor with the knife in his hand, the poor boy fell upon his knees before him, offered him all the money he had, his knife, his cap, and whatever else he liked, and said he would love him during the whole of his life, and never tell what had happened to any human being. This appeal was lost on the murderer, and without making any answer to it, he struck the knife into his throat. On Monday morning, after the operation of pinioning, &c., had been completed, the culprit, attended by the chaplain, &c., walked



steadily to the platform. When he appeared there, he gazed steadily around him. After the rope was adjusted, he exclaimed in a firm and loud tone of voice, "Lord have mercy upon us. Pray good Lord have mercy upon us. Lord have mercy upon us. All people before me take warning by me!" Having been asked if he had any thing farther to say, he repeated the same words, and added, "Lord have mercy upon my poor soul."

---

## AUGUST.

1. OPENING OF THE NEW LONDON BRIDGE.—This ceremony presented the most splendid spectacle that had been witnessed on the Thames for many years. The royal family and their majesties' suite assembled at the Palace about two o'clock, and, at a quarter before three o'clock, the royal procession, consisting of twelve carriages, was formed in the gardens of the Palace. The king, who appeared in the Windsor uniform, entered the last carriage, accompanied by the queen, the duchess of Cumberland, and the duchess of Cambridge. In the preceding carriages were the duke and prince George of Cumberland, attended by baron Linsingen, the rev. Mr. Jelf, and lady Sophia Lennox (the lady in waiting on the duchess of Cumberland), the duke of Sussex, the duchess of Gloucester, the duchess and prince William of Saxe-Weimar, prince George and princess Augusta of Cambridge, attended by baroness Ahlefeldt, the lord Chamberlain, the master of the Horse, the earl Marshal, the groom of the Stole, the lord Chamberlain to the queen, lord Hill as

gold stick in waiting, the treasurer of the Household, the secretary of the Privy Purse, the Clerk Marshal, the marchioness Wellesley, the marchioness of Westmeath, and lady Clinton, the ladies in waiting on the queen; lord and lady Frederick Fitzclarence, lords Adolphus and Augustus Fitzclarence, lady Mary Fox, sir Henry Blackwood, the groom in waiting, lord A. Beauclerk, &c.—An escort, composed of the Life and Royal Horse Guards, was in attendance at the Garden-gate. The royal cavalcade passed up the east side of the Palace, through the iron gates by Marlborough-house into Pall-mall, on their way to Somerset-house.—The appearance of the metropolis along the whole line through which the procession passed, was in every respect as if it were a public holyday. The shops were closed, and business seemed altogether suspended. In every place the streets were crowded by a dense mass, who loudly cheered the royal party in its progress.—At three o'clock the hoisting of the Royal Standard of England over the centre of Somerset-house announced the arrival of their majesties, and was followed by discharges of cannon of all sorts from the wharfs and barges. When the king and queen appeared on the steps descending to the platform from which they were to embark, the cheers from the crowd were almost deafening. The awnings of the barges had been removed by his Majesty's desire, so that a full view of the royal party could be obtained throughout the whole line. When the royal barges moved off from the shore, the firing of cannon, the shouts and huzzas, the waving of hats and handkerchiefs, were renewed, and kept up without



intermission along the whole line, on the river, and the shores at both sides.—The procession moved very slowly, from the wish of their majesties that all those in the line should have a full opportunity of seeing the royal party. It was past four o'clock before the royal barges reached the bridge. An awning had been thrown half-way over the bridge. On the London side, adjacent to the site of the Old Fishmonger's-hall, was erected a splendid pavilion. This was the position allotted to their majesties, the royal suite, the civic authorities, and the more distinguished of the company. The pavilion was constructed of standards that had formerly waved over the armies of almost every civilized nation in the world. The breadth of it was equal to that of the bridge. Its form was quadrangular, and at the four corners were placed, upon raised broad pedestals, groups of men in armour. The pillars which supported the royal pavillion were adorned with flags, shields, helmets, and massive swords. Their majesties' seats were beneath a gorgeous canopy of state, of crimson cloth, the back of which was formed of plate glass. To the right and left of this canopy were places for the members of the royal family, the ministers, and many of the nobility. From the ends of the principal table, and at right angles to it, ran two other narrow tables, which were reserved for the civic authorities and members of Parliament. No other tables were placed in the royal pavilion, and thus a large open space was preserved in front of their majesties, whose view of the whole of the company under the awning was free and unobstructed, except by the drapery which formed the

front of the tent. From this pavilion the awning extended along the narrow part of the bridge to the distance of about 500 feet. On either side there were tables for the guests. The stairs on the London side of the bridge had been covered with crimson cloth, and at the bottom of these stairs their majesties were received with all the formalities usual upon the occasion of royal visits to the city. The king was handed out of his barge by Mr. Routh, who gave his majesty his arm. Mr. Jones, as chairman of the "New London-bridge Committee," was present to receive her majesty on her landing. Upon stepping ashore, the king addressed these gentlemen in the following words: — "Mr. Jones and Mr. Routh, I am very glad to see you on London-bridge. It is certainly a most beautiful edifice; and the spectacle is the grandest and the most delightful in every respect that I ever had the pleasure to witness." His majesty then paused to survey the scene around him. At this moment the air was rent with the most deafening cheers from all sides, and the king, taking off his hat, acknowledged this hearty greeting of his subjects by repeated bows. Their majesties proceeded to the top of the stairs, when the sword and keys of the city were tendered to his majesty by the lord mayor, and on returning them, his majesty signified his wish that they should remain in his lordship's hands. The chairman of the committee then presented his majesty with a gold medal, commemorative of the opening of the bridge, having on one side an impression of the king's head, and, on the reverse, a view of the new bridge, with the dates of the present ceremony, and of



the laying of the first stone. As soon as these formalities were completed, and the whole of the royal party had assembled in the Pavilion, their majesties proceeded to the end of the bridge attended by their royal highnesses the dukes of Cumberland and Sussex, and by the principal members of the royal family. The officers of the royal household, nearly all the ministers, and a vast number of the nobility, and of the members of the House of Commons, composed the royal procession; in going to, and returning from, the Surrey end of the bridge, their majesties threw medals to the spectators on each side of them. As soon as it was announced that their majesties were approaching the bridge, Mr. Green had caused his balloon to be filled, and just as the royal procession had reached the Surrey side of the bridge, Mr. Green, with a Mr. Crawshay for his companion, made his ascent. His majesty showed himself from the parapets on either side the bridge to the assembled multitudes below. After the conclusion of this ceremony, the royal party returned to the pavilion, where a cold collation was laid out. A similar repast was served up to the guests at all the other tables. At the royal table the principal guests were thus placed. On the right of the king were seated the duchess of Gloucester, the duke of Sussex, the duchess of Cambridge, the duchess of Saxe-Weimar, and prince George of Cumberland. On the left of his majesty sat the duke and duchess of Cumberland, and prince George of Cambridge. Mr. Jones was in attendance behind the king's chair, and Mr. Routh stood behind that of the queen. The remainder of the tables in the

pavilion were filled with the other distinguished guests. After the healths of the king and queen had been drank, amid loud acclamations, the lord mayor presented a gold cup of great beauty to the king, who said, taking the cup, "I cannot but refer on this occasion to the great work which has been accomplished by the citizens of London. The city of London has been renowned for its magnificent improvements, and we are commemorating a most extraordinary instance of their skill and talent. I shall propose the source from whence this vast improvement sprung, 'The trade and commerce of the city of London.'" The king then drank of what is called the loving cup, of which every other member of the royal family partook. At six o'clock their majesties re-embarked, amidst the same loud cheering, firing of artillery, ringing of bells, and other marks of respect which had marked their progress down. The procession had a more imposing appearance on its return, in consequence of its being joined by several of the city barges including that of the lord mayor. On landing at Somerset-stairs, their majesties were loudly cheered as before. In going along the platform, the queen, who leant on the king's arm, turned round repeatedly and bowed to the surrounding multitudes. His majesty remained uncovered the whole of the way along the platform. In a few moments after their arrival at Somerset-house, the royal party entered their carriages, and returned to the Palace escorted in the same way as on setting out. The cheers, as their majesties passed along the Strand, were loud and continued.

2. FIRE AT PERA.—A gentle-



man looking into the English palace garden at Pera, in Constantinople, at about ten o'clock in the morning, saw some dry grass smoking, and on pointing it out to the people, they ran to extinguish it with the greatest anxiety, and then informed him, that there was a fire somewhere, which had set the grass smoking by the adhesion of a red-hot nail. He immediately went in search of the fire, and found a few houses in flames at a place called Sakiz Aghatz, in a deep valley between the Great Burying Ground, and the village of S. Demetri. The situation of the place was so remote, and the fire at the time so trifling, that he thought there could be no possible danger to the town; but he was struck by the distance to which fire may be communicated. The palace garden, in which the grass was on fire, stood on the summit of a hill, more than half a mile from the burning houses. The wind which prevailed was that which periodically returns at that time of the year. It comes very strong from the N.E. and continues for three weeks or a month, drying up every substance capable of combustion, and rendering it highly inflammable, and then spreading the flames the moment they begin. The space between the fire and the palace was a steep hill, which presented a face of wooden houses, almost like a pile of dry timber. Against this the flame was driven, and it ascended with incredible activity. Several persons who stood on the brow of the hill over the fire, seeing it travelling fast towards Pera, where they lived, hastened home; but on their return, the streets were so obstructed by crowds hurrying away with their effects,

that they were delayed, and they found the fire had travelled as fast as they did, and was actually at the walls of the English palace garden, and entering the Pera-street as soon as themselves. It was generally supposed, that the English palace, insulated in the middle of an open area, could not be reached by the fire; but in a short time the flames spread all round; the houses on all sides of the garden wall were in a blaze, and the whole area of the large garden was canopied by sheets of flame and smoke. Several persons had brought their furniture and effects thither, as to a place of security; but the air became so heated, and loaded with fiery particles, that every thing laid there began to burn. The trees now took fire, and the wind, which had never ceased, suddenly increased to a furious gale, and drove the whole column of flame full against the deserted building. The noise it made was like the roaring of a vast furnace, and it seemed to envelope the whole palace. In a few minutes the palace was observed to smoke violently; flames then burst out of the windows, and in about twenty minutes the roof fell in, and nothing remained of this fine edifice and all it contained, but scorched walls and smoking ashes. Thence the fire took the direction of Pera, consuming every thing before it with irresistible and incredible force; the fire-proof stone houses opposed no more effective obstacle to it than the wooden sheds. The residences of the French, Dutch, Sardinian, Russian, and Prussian Ambassadors, and the merchants' houses, were consumed: and in about six hours all the palaces of the European missions were destroyed, except



the Austrian and Swedish, which were out of the direct line of the fire. The latter had been burnt before, and little remained of it but the gate-house; the former had belonged to the Venetian embassy: it had stood almost since the time of the Crusades, and the flames seemed to turn aside from it as if they knew it to be incombustible. The fire continued to extend through different directions, particularly down Casim Pasha till eight or nine in the evening, when the wind subsided, and its progress was stopped, after extending over an area about three miles in circumference, and consuming all that part of the peninsula that former fires had spared. The next morning presented a dismal spectacle. The people, driven from their houses, had no place of retreat but the burying-ground: there they were seen in thousands stretched on the earth, with no covering but the sky, and no bed but the graves. The Sultan immediately directed, that barracks and other large edifices should be appropriated for their shelter, and he distributed among them 100,000 piastres. A return was made to him of the number of persons burnt out, and they amounted to 80,000.

ACCIDENT BY A STEAM BOAT.—An inquest was held, on the body of Philip Glendining, who, with his wife, and a man named Philip Walker, were drowned in consequence of a sand barge, in which they were, being run down by the *Pluto* Government steam-packet. The body, from the length of time it had been in the water, could be identified only by the dress.—Robert Glendining, the brother of the deceased, deposed, that the last time he saw his

brother alive, was on the morning of Sunday the 24th of July, when he was in a barge anchored off Erith, and near to what is called Julian or Geningtree Point. He was there for the purpose of taking up sand, and had on board his wife and a man named Walker. Captain Blackwood, of the *Freeman Trader*, stated, that, on Monday, the 25th of July, between six and seven o'clock in the morning, he was in his vessel running up against tide. At the bottom of Half-way-reach he observed a steam vessel, which had passed him twice that ebb, coming up the river. She was a Government packet, and had naval officers on board. She was running up at the rate of nine knots an hour, which was her full speed. He saw a barge moored with her head to land, and her helm a-starboard, about 100 yards from land. There was another barge a-head of her, in which there were five persons, who were making preparations to work. There were two men and a woman in the lower barge, who were looking at the steamer as she approached. The witness and his wife were looking at both the vessels, and on seeing their position, he observed to her that the steamer would run right over the barge. He had scarcely spoken, when he saw her do so. The steamer struck the barge mid-ship, tumbled her mast overboard, and she sunk with the two men and the woman. One of the men clasped the woman in one of his arms, and held on to the steam boat with the other for a few seconds; he then letting go his hold, and both sank. He saw on the deck a person, whom he supposed to be the engineer, take something in his hand for the purpose, as he conceived, of stopping the steamer,



She was, however, first stopped by the violent concussion, and slewed round for four or five minutes. A man from the steamer got into a boat, which was towing astern, but not until two boats from other vessels had reached the spot, to afford assistance to the sufferers, but they were unsuccessful. If due exertion had been made by the persons on board the steamer, the people might have been saved. He thought the persons on board the steam vessel were endeavouring to cut off the point, and get a-head of another steamer which was before her at the time of the accident.

Mr. Charles Beer, who was on board a Herne hoy on the evening of the 25th of July. last, as a passenger to London, gave a similar account of the accident. As the vessel came nearer the barge, he heard the persons on board the latter call out repeatedly to those in the steamer, not to board them; but though there were three persons on each of the paddle boxes, and several on the deck of the steamer who must have seen the barge, no exertion was made to keep clear of her, and the steamer did not in the slightest degree change her course. Her paddle-boxes came on the gunwale of the barge, and knocked her mast and one of the men in her overboard. The other man caught hold of the woman in one arm, and clung to the steamer's side for some moments, when the woman first fell into the water, and he afterwards. "There was nothing," he said, "to obstruct the view of the persons on board the steamer from seeing the barge for at least a quarter of a mile before they came up to her; he was sure that those on board must have heard

the calls of the persons in the barge to keep clear of them; and the steamer should not have ventured between the barge and the shore. If ordinary caution had been taken, the accident would not have happened. If the persons on board the steam packet had had the greatest enmity towards the poor people who were lost, they could not have more effectively have run them down.

Henry Meirs, said, that on Monday week he went on board the Pluto steam vessel, and was in her at the time of the accident. Lieutenant Buchanan had the command of her, but her management was left solely to the direction of a pilot named Richard Powell, who was on board. The Pluto had never been down the river before, and the object of the voyage was merely to try her speed and the power of her engines. Previous to the accident happening, witness was walking on the larboard side of the Pluto, and, being engaged in observing the working of the engines, did not see the barge. He heard the pilot call out "hard a-starboard" just before she struck. Orders were given immediately to stop her engines, and they were stopped. He thought they were stopped before she struck the barge. He used every effort to save a female whom he saw clinging to the side of the vessel, but was unsuccessful. The Pluto, by log, was going at the rate of nine miles and three-quarters an hour at the time of the accident, which was, he thought, her full speed. There was no object to prevent the pilot from seeing the barge, and the pilot did not alter the course of the vessel for some time before the accident. Witness was of opinion that the affair was entirely



accidental, and unintentional on the part of the pilot. Steam boats are generally quick in answering their helm, and from the circumstance of the *Pluto* not answering helm at the time of the accident, she must have been aground. The persons who were on the paddle boxes were gentlemen, and not persons to look out. He had observed the pilot, a few moments before the accident, and he then appeared to be attending to his duty.

The Jury returned a verdict of *Manslaughter* against Richard Powell, the pilot.

Next day, a Court Martial assembled at Woolwich, to try Lieutenant Buchanan, the commander, Mr. Davis, the second master of the *Pluto*, and Powell, the pilot, for running down the barge.

Lieutenant A. Kennedy, commander of the steam vessel *Hermes*, deposed ; I was on board the *Pluto* on the 25th of July, when she ran down a barge. About forty minutes past six p. m. I was standing on the starboard side of the fore-castle, in company with Lieutenant Simmons, when he suddenly observed to me, "Do you see the barges a-head?" We both immediately turned round, and I called out to Lieutenant Buchanan, who was standing on the starboard paddle-box, and asked him if he saw the barge a-head. He replied, "We see her—the helm is hard a starboard." Supposing that the man at the helm had by mistake put the helm the wrong way, I jumped on one side to get a sight of the "Tell-tale," when I found that the helm was hard a starboard, as reported; and although the machinery was instantly stopped, the tide came so very sharp round the point where

the barges lay, that the vessel came to against the helm, and we found that nothing could prevent us from going against the barges, from her amazing velocity. I immediately ran aft, with the intention of jumping overboard to rescue any person I might see in the water, but I found that both the barge and crew had sunk, and the stern-boat had shoved off to assist. The pilot was standing on the quarter-deck at the time the accident happened. He could see the barges, but not sufficiently to judge of their distance properly. If I had had the command of the *Pluto*, I should have considered her under the charge of the pilot. The pilot gave directions to the helmsman. No person had any idea the pilot was going inside the barges. Every endeavour was used by Lieutenant Buchanan and Mr. Davies to save the lives of the people.

Similar evidence was given by other naval persons who were on board the *Pluto* when the accident happened. Lieutenant Simmons stated, he had commanded a Government steam vessel for three years, and when he first took the command, being unaccustomed to steam vessels, he left every thing to his pilot. The master-attendant at Woolwich, stated that he was at London at the time the accident happened, by direction of Sir Byam Martin. If he had been at Woolwich, Powell, the pilot, should not have taken charge of the *Pluto*. The last time Powell took witness down the river, witness was forced to take charge of the vessel out of his hands. Powell was a nervous frightened creature, and he did not think he had been on board a steam vessel above two or three times in his life. The Quarter-Master of the *Pluto*,



stated, that he was at the helm when the accident occurred; he received all his orders from the pilot; sometimes the commander repeated the orders after the pilot. The witness, as well as others, stated, that if the Pluto had answered her helm, as might have been expected, she would have cleared the barge.

Lieutenant Buchanan presented a written narrative to the court, stating, that, on Powell coming on board, he was obliged to receive him as a branch-pilot in preference to any person not having a branch, which was an established custom in the navy. He had no reason to doubt the ability of his pilot, and had he at the moment ordered the helm to be put "hard a port," the Pluto must have run down the other barge. From the rapidity of steam vessels he considered himself more in the hands and power of his pilot than had he commanded any other vessel.

The master of the William and Mary Royal yatch, stated, a branch-pilot can supersede any other, the moment he goes on board. Had known an instance where a branch-pilot was refused, and recovered his money due for the pilotage.—Mr. Oliver Laing. On Sunday the 25th of July, he was on board the Pluto, when Mr. Powell came on board: he said that he was sent on board by order of Mr. Brown, the master attendant, and that he was a branch-pilot, and as such he could supersede the mate of the Comet.—Lieutenant Buchanan replied, that as he was a branch-pilot, he would allow him to take charge.—John Buxton, clerk to the master-attendant, stated, that he did not send Powell to take charge of the Pluto. He met Powell by the water-side, who

asked him, if any pilot had been appointed to the Pluto. Witness told him that he believed not. He then turned round and said, that he would go on board the Pluto and see, or words to that effect.

After a short deliberation, the Judge advocate announced, that it was the unanimous opinion of the court, that the accident arose from the ignorance of Richard Powell, the pilot, and that no blame was attached to Lieutenant Buchanan, or to Mr. Davis, the second-master; and they were acquitted.

2. INQUEST.—FIVE PERSONS DROWNED.—An inquest was held on the bodies of Sarah Winter and Charles Edgar, who, along with three others, had been drowned in the Thames, by the upsetting of a boat, supposed to have been occasioned by the too near approach of a steam-vessel.—It appeared from the evidence, that, on Sunday morning last, a party of friends, consisting of four men, two women, and three children, in the whole nine persons, embarked from a wharf near the old London-bridge, on board a jolly-boat belonging to the Smith Hoy, proceeded down the river, and spent the day at the Barge-house, opposite the royal arsenal at Woolwich. About five o'clock in the afternoon they embarked again, and having little wind, the deceased, C. Edgar, having the command of the boat, set the sails. When nearly opposite the Upper-sand-wharf, on the Essex shore, one of the oars happened to slip overboard, and the sails were struck to recover it. When this was effected, owing to something being wrong aloft, the deceased clambered up the mast, at the time the Comet government steam-packet was proceeding on



her way to London, at a moderate rate. The swell produced by the Comet struck the boat on the broadside, while the deceased was in the act of descending the mast, and he having missed his foothold, his weight resting on the upper part of the mast, upset the boat, the whole party were precipitated into the river, and five of them were drowned.—The Jury found a verdict of “Accidental Death.”

4. A water-spout burst upon the Clidagh mountains (co. Kerry), within two miles of the Balleyvourney road, by which a vast tract of ground under tillage was totally destroyed, and nine persons lost their lives. The Glanfesk bridge was covered, and the battlements swept away. The bed of the Flesk river is thirty-eight feet from the centre arch of the bridge, but, in five minutes, the water flowed over the battlements. Three houses were swept away. The flood, at its height, appeared like an arm of the sea; its depth in the valley was from fifteen to sixteen feet, and in breadth it was upwards of 300 yards. The ground, which a few minutes before was adorned with a rich luxuriant harvest, was covered with sand, rocks, stones, &c., three feet deep; and it will require three years’ labour before it will be productive to the owners.

POISONING.—Mary Ann Higgins, aged 19, and Edward Clarke, aged 21, were indicted for the wilful murder of William Higgins, at Coventry, on the 22nd of March last, by administering to him three drachms of arsenic. In a second count of the indictment, the prisoner Higgins was charged as principal, and Clarke as accessory. — William Higgins, the deceased, was a man in an humble station of life, who

had saved a little money, upwards of 100*l.*, which he had placed out at interest. Upon the death of his only brother, who left four or five children behind him, the deceased, being himself unmarried, took one of the children (the female prisoner) to live with him, and reared her, intending also to leave her, at his death, the little money he possessed. About the beginning of the present year, a courtship commenced between the girl and the prisoner Clarke, who was an apprentice at the watch-factory of Messrs. Vale and Co., at Coventry, in the course of which he evidently acquired considerable influence over her mind. He was observed, within the last few weeks, to be in possession of more money than usual, including one or two golden guineas, a denomination of coin of which the deceased’s savings were supposed principally to have consisted; and he boasted on more than one occasion, that he had only to go to the old man’s house whenever he wanted money. On Tuesday, the 22nd of March, the female prisoner went into a druggist’s shop, and asked for two penny-worth of arsenic to destroy rats. The young man in the shop told her that she could not have it, except in the presence of a witness, upon which she went away and did not return. She afterwards went to another shop of the same description, and made a similar application, to which she received the like answer. Upon this she observed that she did not know what she was to do, as she came from the country. She added, however, that she had a sister residing at Coventry, and she would go and fetch her. She then left the shop, and, when passing through Spon-street, she met a girl named Elizabeth Russel, who told her



that she was going to the factory (Vale and Co's), upon which the prisoner said, "Just come with me as far as Messrs. Wyly's, the druggist, and I will then accompany you to the factory." Elizabeth Russel asked her what she wanted at the druggist's? To which she replied, that she wanted some arsenic to destroy rats. The girl then accompanied her to the druggist's, where she received the arsenic in her presence, with a label upon the paper, having the words "arsenic, poison," printed on it. She inquired of the shopman how she was to use it, in order to destroy the rats, and he told her she might mix it up with some bread, or some substance of that kind. She then left the shop, and, on going into the street, she tore off the label, saying at the same time to the other girl, "What has he stuck this on for?" They walked together as far as the factory, which they reached as the men were coming out of it to go to their dinners, it being then about one o'clock. They here parted, and Higgins was joined by Clarke, who walked with her towards her uncle's house. A waggoner, who was passing along the street shortly afterwards, observed Clarke entering the uncle's house, and the niece next moment closed the door, which Clarke had left open after him. At two o'clock Clarke returned to his work at the factory, and remained there until eight in the evening. About nine he was observed standing at the entry that led from the deceased's house to a yard where there was a certain convenience, from which the old man was seen apparently returning. The niece was also observed standing at the entry. Whilst the old man was in the

yard, a particular kind of noise was heard, and the place afterwards exhibited the appearance of a person having been vomiting there. At about one o'clock at midnight, the female prisoner knocked up an old woman, named Green, who lived a few doors off, and implored her, for God's sake, to come to her uncle, who was taken very ill. Mrs. Green accordingly got out of bed, put on her gown, and followed her over to her uncle's. On her way, Mrs. Green was met by a man, who, when passing by Higgins's door the moment before, heard two voices, as he thought, in the house, but could not tell whether they were the voices of a male and female. Upon Mrs. Green going into the house, she found the deceased lying upon his niece's bed, with his head resting on his left hand, in the attitude of a man who had been vomiting. Upon going up to him, she thought at first she heard him breathe, but found, when she stirred him, that he was stiff. She called to him, but received no answer. Observing some water on the floor near the bed, and knowing that the old man had been subject to a complaint which she called the water-swamp, she proposed going down stairs and making some tea for him. She and the niece went down accordingly, and while below, the latter said, "Oh! I hear my uncle groan." They immediately returned to the room, but on Mrs. Green again going to the bed, she found that the old man was dead, and also concluded from a more particular examination of his body, that he must have been dead for at least half an hour. The niece wept bitterly, exclaiming, "Oh my dear uncle! my dear uncle! now he's gone, all my



friends are gone !” She told Mrs. Green, that she and Edward Clarke were to have been married on Easter Monday, and that, had it not been for her poor uncle’s death, they were all to have had a jovial day of it. She said, that they must still be married, however, on that day, as she was in the family way ; that she would put on mourning for her uncle, but put it off on the day of her marriage, and then resume it again, it being unlucky to be married in black. The statement of her being in the family way was untrue. In answer to previous questions from Mrs. Green, she said that her uncle had had some pea-soup for supper ; that he had been taken very ill, and gone to bed ; but, after she had retired to her own bed, her uncle came into her room, and, becoming very sick, she got up, and placed him on her bed. Mrs. Green observed the bed in the deceased’s room very much tumbled, as if by a person who had been tossing from side to side in great pain. There was also a quantity of water on the floor, with two little lumps of bread in it, like what had been discharged from the stomach. Some other of the neighbours being called in to assist in laying out the deceased, Mrs. Green went away. In the course of the morning, between six and seven o’clock, another neighbour, a Mrs. Moore, called, and, on seeing the niece, asked if it was true that her uncle was dead ? She said it was, and that she was then going out to purchase mourning. She went out accordingly, and, when she was gone, Mrs. Moore, seeing the place in a state of confusion, set about putting the things to rights. On going into the pantry, she perceived a basin on the shelf, about three-quarters filled with pea-soup. She

took it to the window, and stirred it up with a spoon that lay in it ; upon which she perceived that it was of a whitish colour and thick substance, different from the usual appearance of pea-soup. She replaced it on the shelf, and then examined another basin, containing a similar quantity of pea-soup, which, however, was of the usual yellow colour, and of the ordinary substance. This basin she also replaced on the shelf, and said nothing until the niece returned, when she asked her the cause of the different appearances of the two soups ? to which the latter replied, that she had thickened one with flour, and the other with oatmeal. Mrs. Moore’s suspicions having been excited, she gave the soup into the charge of a carpenter who had come to measure for the coffin, who locked it up in the room in which the corpse lay. A surgeon was then sent for, who opened the body, and found the coat of the stomach extremely vascular and red. He also found within the stomach a pint and a half of fluid, which he put into a bottle, and which he sent, together with the basins of soup, in a basket, to his surgery, for the purpose of having them analysed. The fluid taken from the stomach was afterwards submitted to several chymical tests, in the presence of four or five professional gentlemen, all of which led to the same result—namely, that it was impregnated with arsenic. All these tests were admitted by these gentlemen to be fallacious, taken individually, except that of reduction—a process by which small crystals of arsenic were extracted from the metal. The result of this and other tests, coupled with the appearances which the coat of the stomach presented, left no doubt on the minds of



the medical witnesses, that the death of the deceased had been occasioned by his having swallowed a quantity of the above poison. The pea-soup was not analysed, but was given to a dog, which immediately threw it off his stomach, and survived. When taken into custody, Higgins told the officer, that she had not purchased any arsenic, and on his saying, that Elizabeth Russell could prove that she had, she admitted it, but said that she had only used it to destroy rats, and that one lay dead under a particular chair. A dead mouse was found under that chair, but, on its being opened, there was no appearance of inflammation in the stomach, which there must have been, had it died from having swallowed arsenic. She also denied having any money in her possession, but, on being searched, a box was found in one of her pockets, containing five guineas, in another three, and in a purse one guinea, a half guinea, and a seven shilling piece. The officer, when conveying her to prison, said to her, "How could you be over-persuaded to do such a thing?" to which she replied that she had not been persuaded by any person, she had done it herself. She said she had put two teaspoonfulls of arsenic into a basin, and poured the soup over it, and then gave that to her uncle. Having extracted this confession from her, the officer then told her not to say any thing that might criminate her. When before the coroner, she said at first that Clarke had received of her only two guineas and some silver. She said this in Clarke's presence; but, after they had both withdrawn, she was persuaded by the officer and another constable to return to the room and declare that Clarke had insti-

gated her to take her uncle's life; and that he (Clarke) had frequently beaten and ill-used her, when he did not get as much money from her as he wanted. The conduct of the officer was severely reprobated. The circumstances of suspicion adduced against Clarke, consisted of his statements at the factory the next morning, of his having been present when the deceased supped the night before, and his betraying a knowledge at an early hour that the old man was dead. It appeared, however, that he had made no secret of having been present when the deceased had taken the soup which had proved fatal to him, and that he had acquired his knowledge of his death by calling at his house next morning at an early hour to inquire how he did. There were no circumstances to lead to a positive conclusion that he had been aware of the poison having been put into the soup, or of its having been purchased at all. Several witnesses gave Clarke a good character, but none appeared on behalf of Higgins.—The Jury returned a verdict, *acquitting* Edward Clarke, but finding Mary Ann Higgins *Guilty*.—The Judge then sentenced the wretched girl to be executed at Coventry on the following Thursday, and her body to be dissected.

11. HURRICANE AT BARBADOES.—On the 11th of August, a dreadful hurricane visited Barbadoes, by which almost every house was either destroyed or injured. The government house was un-roofed, and the governor saved his life only by taking refuge in the cellar. The Custom-house was blown down; all the churches were damaged, St. Paul's and St. Mary's being entirely destroyed. This tremendous hurricane was



felt also at Dominica, St. Vincent's, and other islands. The appearance of the preceding evening (the 10th) indicated unsettled weather, and many persons prognosticated that there would be a gale before the morning. The wind was rather high, and about ten o'clock there was a shower of rain, which was succeeded by a calm. After this, a dense mass of clouds gathered over the horizon, and remained for some time suspended in gloom. At twelve, they burst in a severe squall, which was followed by a heavy rain, with a smart breeze from N.E. The wind began to increase, and in two hours it blew a tremendous gale, but moderated for a short time, when it suddenly became more violent, and at three o'clock was a perfect hurricane. From this hour until five o'clock it raged with unparalleled violence, whilst the lightning at intervals cast a momentary glare on the objects around. The houses were either levelled with the earth or unroofed; the largest trees were torn from their roots, or broken as reeds. Numerous individuals were buried under the ruins, or threatened with instant death at each successive blast that hurled the shattered fragments in every direction. The wind had now veered to E., back to N. and to N.W.; again it shifted, and blew fiercely from E., veered to S.E., and about six o'clock burst from S. W. with renewed violence, accompanied by torrents of rain. For two hours the wind and rain continued thus. When the light of day dawned, the howling of the winds, and the crashing of the falling ruins having ceased, the shrieks of the affrighted, and the groans of the wounded and dying, broke in piti-

able sounds on the ears of the survivors. The fields, which the day before presented so luxuriant an appearance, were completely changed into a desert—neither canes, corn, nor provisions, with a few inconsiderable exceptions, having been left on the ground. The houses, as well as windmills, were thrown down; parts of them were conveyed to an astonishing distance; and much costly furniture was destroyed or materially injured.

17. STORM. — Liverpool was visited about three o'clock a.m., with a most appalling storm of thunder, lightning, and rain, which continued with unabated violence till about five o'clock a.m., when the thunder and lightning ceased, but the rain still poured down in torrents until about six o'clock a.m., when it abated a little, and finally ceased about ten o'clock. The poor, who inhabited the cellars in White-chapel, and about the Custom-house, suffered great privations from the rain, and were aroused from their slumbers by finding their beds completely covered with water, which accumulated to that degree in their habitations, that many, stepping out of their beds, found themselves up to their waist in water. Several grocers and others suffered considerably from the rain getting into their warehouses and destroying their property.

Between five and six o'clock on the same afternoon, as a coach was passing Hyde-park-corner, one of the horses was struck by a flash of lightning, and instantly fell dead. In the counties of Kent and Surrey the storm was equally severe as in the metropolis. On the Maidstone-road a flash of light-



ningstruck a tree, which it withered in an instant, and killed eighteen sheep who were taking refuge underneath it.

**LOSS OF THE ROTHSAY STEAM PACKET.\***—At an early hour on the morning of Wednesday, a severe storm had, more than usually, agitated the waters of the Mersey; so much so, that an American ship, which had attempted by means of a steam-boat to put to sea, was compelled to return. At eleven o'clock, the *Rothsay Castle* steamer sailed from Liverpool for Beaumaris. Her deck was thronged with passengers. The precise number cannot be known, because, in addition to those who registered their names in the books, many individuals, by whom no previous application had been made at the packet-office, were taken immediately from the pier-head. The captain, crew, and musicians, amounted to fourteen or fifteen; and besides these, one hundred and twenty or one hundred and thirty persons were on board. The greater proportion of the passengers consisted of holiday or family parties, residing in country places. In one of these companies were twenty-six persons who set out on an excursion of pleasure from Bury, in Lancashire.

The weather was not at all tempestuous, when the packet weighed anchor; but, soon after her departure, the wind blew strongly from the North West; and as she had to contend with the tide which began to flow as she passed the Rock, and had but one engine, her progress was slow. When she arrived off the Floating-

light, about fifteen miles from Liverpool, the roughness of the sea alarmed many of the passengers. Mr. Tarrey, of Bury, who had on board with him his wife, their five children, and a servant, being under great apprehension for his own safety, and that of his family, went down to the cabin, where the captain was at dinner, and earnestly begged that he would put back. The captain's reply was, "I think there is a great deal of fear among you, and very little danger. If we were to turn back with passengers, it would never do,—we should have no profit." To another gentleman who remonstrated with him, he is reported to have said, in an angry tone, "I am not one of those who turn back." For the space of two hours he remained in the cabin, and peremptorily resisted all importunities, observing, that, if the passengers knew him, they would forbear so to trouble him. After dinner, he became violent in his manner; and his language, especially to his men, was coarse and abusive in the extreme. When anxiously questioned by the passengers as to the progress of the vessel, and the time at which she was likely to reach her destination, he gave always trifling, and often contradictory, answers. During the early part of the day, he had spoken again and again of their being able to reach Beaumaris by seven o'clock; but the evening wore away, night drew on, and they appeared to be still far from the termination of their voyage. They were long in getting from the Little to the Great Ormeshead. One of the passengers implored the captain to put into Conway. His reply was, "God keep me from attempting it; it would be

\* See "A Narrative of the Wreck of the *Rothsay Castle Steam Packet*," by James Hews Bransby. London. 1832.



certain destruction." In this instance his judgment was correct.

It was nearly midnight when they arrived at the mouth of the Menai Strait, within five or six miles of Beaumaris. The tide had for some hours been running out, and, in consequence, had impeded their progress: but it was now just upon the turn. According to the statement of Jones the fireman, and two of the seamen who were saved, they had "rounded the buoy," at the extremity of what is termed the "Spit," and had proceeded up the river, as far as the tower upon Priestholme, or, as it is generally called, Puffin Island; when, on a sudden, the steam failed to such a degree, that the engine had not power to keep the vessel in her proper course. The fireman, on being asked why there was no steam, said that the vessel had been leaky throughout the whole voyage, and that some time before she reached the Strait, the bilge-pumps were choked. The water in her hold overflowed the coals; so that, in renewing the fires, a considerable quantity went in with the coals, slackened the fires, and made it impossible to keep up the steam. She now drifted, with the flood-tide and a heavy gale from the North-West, towards a bank situated about three quarters of a mile from Puffin Island, and known by the name of the Dutchman's bank; and on this spot she struck. The vessel rolled in a terrific manner. Lieut. Atkinson directed the steersman to put the helm a starboard. The man, instead of doing so, put it to port; when the mate observing what had taken place, ran aft, seized the helm, and put it to starboard. The engine had previously stopped for above ten minutes; the reason was, that the

coals were covered with water, the pumps were choked and quite useless, and the water had extinguished the fires. Finding that the vessel had struck, the captain carelessly remarked, "Oh, it is only sand, and she will soon float." On this, with the aid of three or four of the passengers, he contrived to get the gib up." It was unquestionably his intention to wear the vessel round and bring her head to the northward. The captain begged the passengers to run aft, in the hope that by removing the pressure from the stem of the vessel, they might cause her to float; and when this expedient failed, he ordered them to run forward. Every exertion was fruitless, and all gave themselves up for lost. Several of the passengers urged the captain to hoist flags, to fire a gun, and to make other signals of distress; he, however, positively refused, declaring that there was no danger, that every thing was just as it should be, and that the packet was afloat and on her way. To every one else it was obvious, that she was sticking fast in the sand, and her cabins were rapidly filling with water. The alarum bell was rung; but in less than a quarter of an hour, the clapper dropt, and could not afterwards be found. Some of the passengers continued to strike the bell for some time with a stone or a piece of coal, and it was faintly heard at Beaumaris, but as no lights were hoisted on the mast of the steamer (a fatal neglect!) it was impossible to know whence the sound proceeded.

The moon, though in a slight degree overcast, flung a pale and trembling radiance on the surrounding objects, so that they were distinctly visible. A strong



breeze blew from the North West, the tide began to set in with great rapidity, and a heavy sea beat over the bank, on which the steam packet, after "dragging and lurching" for more than half an hour, was at length firmly and immoveably fixed. It was just before this, that a Liverpool branch pilot on board, William Jones, became aware of the full extent of the danger. The poor man had that very morning reached Liverpool from a foreign voyage, and had joined the packet by way of recreation. Fatigued by the labour that he had undergone before entering the packet, he had lain down in the fore-castle to sleep, when he felt the vessel strike. Hastily rushing upon deck, he exclaimed, "We are all lost!" and his courage and coolness were for a moment quite overcome. "I saw," said he, "the quality huddled together in the waist of the vessel, and the praying and crying was the most terrible sight to witness. The sea broke over on both sides, and took away numbers at once. They went like flights, sometimes many, sometimes few; at last the bulwarks went, and none were left." The vessel had scarcely struck, when two of the stays that supported the chimney, broke. These with much difficulty, were again made fast. They soon, however, yielded a second time, and the chimney fell. It brought the main mast with it: but all within its reach had timely warning, and were careful to get out of its way. "Just now," says Mr. Coxhead, one of the most intelligent of the survivors, "a singular circumstance attracted my observation. One of the seamen came to the binnacle, deliberately took out the lantern which it contained to afford

light to the helmsman, and threw it with great force upon the deck, breaking it into many pieces, and of course extinguishing the light. I cannot bring myself to any other conclusion than that this was intentional, although the man immediately lamented that the only chance of making a signal was now destroyed: for what purpose it was done I cannot tell; he instantly disappeared, and I saw no more of him to my recollection." The steward and his wife lashed themselves to the mast, resolved, as seems to have been the case with several other husbands and wives, to abide the momentous issue together. They were found locked in each other's arms. The parents hung over their children, and mothers perished clasping their little ones. The carpenter of the vessel was seen embracing his wife in the extreme of agony. The poor woman had an infant at her breast, and it appeared to be almost the only object of her care. She besought a young man who stood near, to wrap her shawl more closely around her neck, that it might prevent the water from touching the child. The very next minute a tremendous wave washed her and her babe, and eleven others, into the sea. With a last effort, she raised her hands above the water, and held up her infant, as if to supplicate in its behalf, the pitying eye of Heaven! Soon after the fall of the chimney, the captain's voice was heard for the last time; he and the mate were the early victims of their own lamentable imprudence.

For a short time the vessel continued to resist the action of the waves. She was beaten and tossed about with a violence which made the hearts, even of the stoutest,



tremble and faint within them; for it threatened every instant to dash her into fragments. About forty of the passengers were now upon the quarter deck, clinging to each other in expectation of the moment when they were to share the fate which had overtaken so many of their companions, and occasionally uttering the most piteous cries for help. On a sudden, a mountain wave rolled towards them with impetuous fury, separated the ship in two, and plunged them headlong into the foaming element. Those who could preserve any degree of collectedness, endeavoured to catch at whatever was floating around them: many grasped at the slightest object that offered itself, but they either were too weak to keep their hold, or were forced by the raging of the surge to relinquish it. The small number of those who attached themselves to the portion of the wreck which was left on the bank, gradually grew smaller as they sunk, one after another, under their fatigues, or were hurled into the deep by the waves. The lives of a very few were ultimately snatched from destruction.

The sad catastrophe was not known on shore, until nearly four o'clock in the morning; when one of the pilots at Penmon point, in Anglesey, observed what he thought to be a vessel "trolling over the Dutchman's Bank towards Conway Bay;" but what, when he viewed it through a glass, he discovered to be the remains of a vessel on the sands, with a man clinging to her mast. By this time two other pilots had come down to the point, and all three instantly launched their boat, hoisted sail, and directed their course to the wreck, which was two miles dis-

tant. On arriving at the spot, they found a gentleman, Mr. John Duckworth, of Bury, supporting himself amidst the surf on a fragment of the steamer, called "the belfry," his head being above water only at intervals. They rescued him from his perilous situation; and took four men off the foremast, which was all but unshipped. The pilots inquired of these individuals whether they thought it would be possible for them, by beating about, to save any more lives. They answered that all except themselves had been swept away by dozens and half dozens, hours before. The pilots then made the best of their way to Beaumaris. Shortly after leaving the wreck they picked up Mr. Tinné, of Liverpool, who was floating on a plank. He was senseless, and had nothing on but his shirt and waistcoat. The church clock was striking six when they reached Beaumaris. About half an hour before this, a young collegian, Mr. Wm. Lewis Walker, happening to be on the Green at Beaumaris, had seen, a great way off, something which he imagined to be a boat drifting among the billows, but which in the end was found to be that part of the shattered steamer on which were nine human beings, who had hoisted a handkerchief as a signal of distress, in the hope that it might attract notice. Mr. Walker manned the life-boat at Beaumaris, and proceeded on his errand of mercy. — Mr. Williamson of the *Campeadora*, a yacht lying in the Bay, under Beaumaris Green, immediately manned his three boats, and went himself for the purpose of bearing a part in this work of compassion. From the direction of the wind and the state of the tide, it was natural to conclude that such



part of the luggage as might float, would be washed ashore on the Carnarvonshire coast; and under this impression, Sir Richard Bulkeley, with his agent, Mr. Thomas Williams, crossed the sands at an early hour to Penmaen Mawr, and ordered his tenants to secure for the rightful owners whatever might come into their possession. Scarcely a boat remained at Beaumaris: all were despatched to the fatal spot. Anxiety and sorrow were painted on every countenance; the pursuits of business and pleasure were suspended; the yachts and other vessels in the Bay had their flags half-mast high.

The sufferings and perils of the few who survived were various. A Mr. Nuttall was one of a group who were lifting up their hearts to the Almighty in silent but earnest prayer. Whilst thus engaged, a heavy surge rushed upon them, and they occasionally knelt down to avoid the fury of the dashing waves. Scarcely two minutes had elapsed before the side of the vessel, near which they were stationed, was forced in by the sea, and they were all hurried into the roaring abyss. The party consisted of Mr. Nuttall, Miss Lamb, Miss Whittaker, two little boys of whom Miss Whittaker had taken charge, Miss Walmsley, and others. Mr. Nuttall fell head-foremost into the sea; not being able to swim, in his first struggles he went over head three or four times, and each time, as he rose to the surface, his temples struck against pieces of the wreck. He was about to sink, and reclined his head upon the water in the hope that death would terminate his sorrows; but this feeling was succeeded by another, that it was incumbent upon him for his own sake and that

of his wife and family, to use his best exertions to save himself from a watery grave. He lifted up his head, and observed floating near him the side of the packet, which, by giving way, had precipitated himself and his friends into the water. He seized it with some difficulty, got upon it, and rested there for a few moments on his knees. At this very time, a boy, about ten years of age, the son of the steersman, mounted upon Mr. Nuttall's back, and notwithstanding every entreaty and remonstrance, clung fast and would not quit his hold. Mr. Nuttall was encumbered with all his clothes, with his great coat, and with the additional weight of the boy; so that he expected every moment to sink. He perceived a rope hanging on the outside of the quarter deck; after a desperate struggle, he grasped it and found that it was firmly fixed to the side of what remained of the vessel. He clambered up the rudder-wheel with the boy still on his back, and at length succeeded in reaching the quarter-deck. When he had obtained a footing upon the wreck—for the packet had separated some time before he had left her—he heard a piteous cry; and looking down upon the surface of the water, observed a female hanging by the side of the wreck, and apparently about to sink. He knew not who she was, but being anxious to extricate her from her appalling situation, he descended, by means of the rope before referred to, and seizing her by the hair of her head, placed her safely upon the quarter-deck. With astonishment and pleasure he discovered that the individual whom he had thus rescued was his neighbour, Miss Whittaker. Jones the stew-



ard, and his wife, were on this portion of the packet. After hurrying to and fro, and trying a variety of expedients, the poor man lashed himself and his wife to the mast which was then lying across the quarter-deck. Several ladies, all of whom had their caps and bonnets off, were leaning against the bulwarks, in the most acute anguish of mind. Their distress was of short continuance; for in a few seconds the waves forced in the railing, and all of them, together with Jones and his wife, were swept into the sea. Mr. Nuttall, Miss Whittaker, Jones the Liverpool pilot, the boy, and two gentlemen, were preserved on the quarter deck at this time, by firmly grasping the rudder-wheel. The fragment of wreck on which they were left was about three yards square, including the wheel. It soon began to float, and it continued to do so, until the passengers upon it were delivered by the Beaumaris life-boat. Whilst they were tossing about, they picked up three gentlemen, one of whom was Mr. Henry Wilson, of Manchester. When day-light appeared, Mr. Nuttall pulled out a silk handkerchief from his pocket, and it was raised on a piece of wood, in the hope that it might be observed and prove the means of bringing relief. The party could perceive individuals walking in the fields on the Carnarvonshire side of the bay, but no eye seemed to glance at the distressed and anxious sufferers. At length Miss Whittaker resigned part of her flannel petticoat to serve as a sail, and it was hoisted up. They continued to drift towards the Carnarvonshire shore, but still seemed to be far from effectual aid. Mr. Nuttall, and Jones the Liverpool pilot, then de-

termined to seize the first fragments of wreck that should present themselves, and to employ them as oars. They almost immediately picked up two pieces of wood, and with these the raft was propelled by them on the bosom of the deep. Whilst they were thus engaged, they saw the Beaumaris life-boat on its way towards them!

Mr. Robert Whittaker, brazier, of Bury, states, that, when he left the vessel, there were about fifty persons on board; of whom, some were on the mast, some on the paddle-box, and some on the cross pieces of timber which served to connect the wheels. He saw Mr. John Wilkinson, of Bury, hanging by his hands from a piece of iron that ran from one paddle-wheel case to the other. He had, himself, clung for some time to the same object. Mr. Wilkinson was crying, with importunate earnestness, for mercy. Mr. Whittaker was driven by the waves through the paddle-box casings into the sea, on the higher or lee side of the vessel. After he had risen to the surface of the water, he seized part of the casing of the paddle-wheels, and contrived to pull over it a short broad plank, at right angles. He got astride on the narrow piece, and lay with his breast on the other. The narrow piece of timber was about nine feet in length, and four inches in breadth; and the transverse plank about five feet in length. He had on only his shirt and stockings. At an early part of the night, he had thrown off his coat and waistcoat, and just before he was plunged into the sea, he divested himself of his trowsers, in the pockets of which were eighty sovereigns. On his frail support he continued to float about for nine hours. The waves occasionally



beat over him, so as to threaten immediate destruction, and it was not without the utmost care that he was able to preserve his seat on the timber. After he had been a short time in the water, he conceived that he had been there for several days. At the period when the dread of death was most powerful, he heard the sound of human voices hailing him. He answered; and in a moment some one cried out, "Hold on, my hearty!" His deliverers were Mr. Williamson and the crew of the *Campeadora* schooner. Mr. Whittaker, it appears, had long before entirely lost his sight. He imagined that day would never break, and had a horrid idea that the sea-birds would peck him to death. He was astonished when the sailors told him that it was open day. From the very first shock he had given up all hope of escape. Just before the vessel separated, he kissed his own little boy and his nephew, and bade them farewell; and at the same moment, he saw his sister sink, as he thought, to rise no more. On being carried to the *Campeadora*, he was rubbed with cloths, and warm water was applied to his feet: and, after a short time, he recovered the powers of vision, and felt himself comparatively strong. At eight o'clock the next morning, he was removed to the inn at Beaumaris, where a most affecting interview took place between him and his sister.

James Martin, another of the passengers, gives the following account of what befel him and his friend Mark Metcalf:—"Observing several individuals on a plank, which reached across the vessel and rested upon the paddle-boxes on each side, upon this plank I

endeavoured to get, and, after some effort, succeeded. I then exhorted Mark to try and do the same; he made several attempts, but failed through want of strength. He then got near one of the paddle-boxes, and laid hold of the iron. I was situated just over him, and had frequent opportunities of conversing with him. The waves were continually dashing over us with great impetuosity, sweeping away the passengers at every stroke. A short interval of ease occurred and I looked for my friend: I found him still at his post, clinging to the iron. I asked him, if he had a firm grip. He answered "Yes; but I am nearly exhausted." At this period, all the passengers who had previous hold of the iron which was under the plank, had disappeared from the violence of the breakers, except my friend Metcalf and another person. A short time only had elapsed, and I saw him carried away by a dreadful wave towards the paddle-box, poor Metcalf exclaiming, "James, I'm afraid its all over!" I replied, "O, Mark, Mark! lay hold of the paddle-box!" He then attempted to do so, and I saw his hand laying hold, when another wave came and swept him right away. "O, James!" said he, as he was carried into the sea, "it's all over now!" I then saw him throw back his hands over his shoulders;—I saw him no more.

"Shortly afterwards, the plank on which I myself and about twenty other persons were situated, gave way, and we were all precipitated into the deep, in the midst of the breakers. I rose to the top of the surge, and struck out my arms, in the hope of laying hold of some floating substance, when I providentially grasped the



identical plank by which I had just before been launched into the sea. On recovering from the stupor of the moment, I discovered two others who had hold of the same plank; one of whom was without clothes. We were not long in getting into smooth water, and the tide was taking us on towards Beaumaris. The naked person, after floating some time, disappeared, and shortly afterwards the other individual, leaving me alone with the plank. As I was struggling and floating, I bethought me it would be much easier for me to get on the plank; I accordingly made an effort, and succeeded, after which I found myself greatly relieved; my chief fear now was, that the tide would turn before any one could perceive me, and that I might thus be carried back and lost after all. Presently I came in sight of Beaumaris harbour, could see several boats, and perceived chimneys smoking. I could distinctly see boats passing to and fro, at a considerable distance, near to Beaumaris. I shouted, in the hope that some one might hear me; and, finding a small spar with a spike, I endeavoured to secure it, and succeeded. To this pike I affixed my handkerchief, waving it over my head, and shouting with all the strength of my lungs. Presently I perceived a boat making towards me, the boat was brought alongside, and I was pulled in, being the second rescued, one having been taken into the boat before me."

Mr. Coxhead, another of the passengers, when the chimney fell, immediately seized one of the ropes attached to the mast, and folded it round his left arm: he earnestly recommended some of the females to adopt the same plan, and did all

in his power to comfort them. At that part of the vessel there were then perhaps forty or fifty persons; nor had any as yet been washed away from it. A tremendous sea however, soon struck over, which appeared to split the vessel from one end to the other; the vessel "lurched" so much, that it was upon its side, in almost a perpendicular position; the passengers naturally clung to one another, or to the side of the ship. "This," says Mr. Coxhead, "was indeed a terrific moment; the sea did not immediately wash us over, but we remained for an instant, as it were with our heads touching the water, when our collective weight carried away the side of the ship, and we were all at once precipitated into the raging element." As he rose, an agonizing cry reached his ear; it was the cry of death. But all was soon hushed; those who could, seized the first thing that presented itself. "Although when I went into the water, I had forgotten the circumstance, I found myself with a rope around my arm, and a wave almost immediately carried me against the side of the wreck. I came with great force, and was knocked away a second time; I tried to recover myself with the same want of success, and as I suffered much from the bruises that I received, I thought for a moment of releasing myself from the rope:—Providence, however, interposed, and I caught the rope with my right hand. This I had before been unable to do, and making great exertion, I threw myself into the net-work at the stern of the vessel. Here I managed to support myself a considerable time, tossed about with the wreck, and incapable of shewing my head above the deck to procure



assistance. After the lapse, however, of about a quarter of an hour, I did so, and prevailed upon two of my fellow-sufferers to give me a hand, by which I was enabled to throw myself on deck, and seize the rudder wheel." This portion of the vessel almost immediately after parted from the wreck, forming a sort of raft, which proved the means of preserving nine persons, who after floating about from seven o'clock, were picked up by the *Campeadora's* boat.

Of all who were on board, only twenty-two were saved.

STATUE TO MR. PITT. — This day a bronze statue was erected in Hanover-square, to the memory of the late right hon. William Pitt, on a pedestal composed of the best Scotch granite, sixteen feet in height, exclusive of the statue, which is ten feet high, and weighs upwards of four tons. Mr. Chantry is the sculptor.

19. CORONER'S INQUEST. — CRUELTY.—An inquest was held on Elizabeth Cooper, aged 75; an inmate of Cripplegate workhouse, who had been afflicted for the last few days with a bowel complaint. On Monday evening she retired to bed about nine o'clock; about three hours afterwards, she cried out to the nurse, "Sarah Hunt, for God's sake come to my assistance, I am very sick and dying." The nurse told her to puke away, and paid no attention to her cries. At length, after an hour had elapsed, another pauper got up and procured a light, and prevailed upon the nurse to come to the assistance of the deceased. As soon as the deceased saw the nurse, she exclaimed—"Oh, you wretch, I told you you should never tie my jaws up, but I was mistaken; I have had something

out of the cup which will be my death." The nurse said she should tie up her jaws, and shortly after the deceased became insensible. No doctor was called in; and the nurse, after remaining with the deceased about half an hour, again retired to her bed. About eight on the following morning, Mrs. Cross, the mistress of the workhouse, paid a visit to the deceased, who remained in much the same state, but still no medical man was called in. She continued in this state of stupor until four o'clock on Tuesday afternoon, when the nurse came up to the bed on which the deceased was lying, and while she continued breathing, pinched her nose in the most violent manner. She then deliberately took a piece of rag and tied up her jaws, then tying her legs together, she left her for a short time, when, finding that she was not dead, she took up the sheet, and thrust it violently against her face with her hand, and when witness remonstrated with her against such cruelty, she told her to go to the devil, and not meddle with her affairs. The nurse of the sick ward came to visit the deceased, and finding that the wretched woman was still living, untied her jaws and legs; some wine was then procured from Mrs. Cross, and administered to the deceased, who lived about half an hour afterwards, and then expired, without having been seen by a medical man.

The Jury returned a verdict, that the deceased died by the visitation of God, and requested the coroner to censure the conduct of Mrs. Cross in not calling in medical aid, and also to reprimand the nurse Hunt for her cruelty towards the deceased.

DUEL BETWEEN FRENCH Po-



LITICIANS. — A few days ago a hostile meeting took place in the Bois de Boulogne between general Sebastiani, minister for Foreign Affairs, and general Lamarque, arising out of a speech of the latter in the Chamber of Deputies, in which he represented M. Lebeau, Belgian minister for Foreign Affairs, as the Sebastiani of Belgium. The seconds present on this occasion, general Jacqueminot and M. de Rumigny, were chosen by general Sebastiani, whose adversary expressed himself satisfied with their presence, and declined appointing any on his own behalf. The affair having been arranged without exchanging shots, a detailed account of the circumstances attendant upon the intended duel was published by the *Tribune*, the tenor of which betrayed, on the part of general Sebastiani's seconds, more anxiety to settle the difference without fighting, than is usually considered consistent with the honour of the principal whom they are called upon to represent. A letter was in consequence addressed to the editor of the *Tribune* by general Jacqueminot and M. de Rumigny, in which they contradicted many of the circumstances stated in that journal, and entered into an explanation which general Lamarque interpreted as unfavourable to himself. Another meeting, in consequence, took place in the Bois de Boulogne, admiral de Rigny acting as the second of general Sebastiani, and general Harispe, for general Lamarque. Two pistol shots having been exchanged without injury to either party, the seconds interfered, and the affair was amicably settled.

19. MANUSCRIPTS OF SIR W. SCOTT'S WORKS. — The MSS. of some of this celebrated writer's

novels, were sold by auction by Mr. Evans, at his sale-rooms in Pall-Mall. The prices for which they were sold were as follows: — Monastery, 18*l.*; Guy Mannering, 27*l.* 10*s.*; Old Mortality, 33*l.*; the Antiquary, 42*l.*; Rob Roy, 50*l.*; Peveril of the Peak, 42*l.*; Waverley (very imperfect) 18*l.*; Abbot, 14*l.*; Ivanhoe, 12*l.*; Pirate, 12*l.*; Fortunes of Nigel, 16*l.*; Kenilworth, 17*l.*; and Bride of Lammermoor, 14*l.* 14*s.*

MUSICAL PHENOMENON. — There is a young man, a nailor, in St. Ninian's, whose compass of voice is so great, that he can with facility sink his voice to low (double) B in the bass scale, a sound far below the compass of the human voice, and adapted only for bass instruments. This, however, is only one-half of what the young nailor can perform; for he can with equal ease ascend from low B to the regions of high C, a distance of twenty-five notes. — *Stirling Journal*.

24. COURT OF CHANCERY. — A case being called on which was partly heard yesterday, Mr. Kindersley, the junior Counsel was proceeding, when he was interrupted by the Lord Chancellor inquiring whether he was to follow Mr. Rose and Mr. Montagu. — Mr. Kindersley replied in the affirmative. — The Lord Chancellor. — "Then I must request you to confine yourself to new matter, and not repeat the arguments I have already heard. It is really no pleasure to hear the same arguments repeated by a third counsel. I sat here till twelve o'clock last night, and did not get through a single bankrupt petition. We have now arrived at the 24th of August, and it is too much to expect the Court to hear argu-



ments thrice repeated. You must, however, use your own discretion, which I have no doubt will be a wise one." The Counsel was proceeding, when, in consequence of some confusion in the body of the Court, the Lord Chancellor, in an extraordinary loud tone, called upon the officer to clear the Court. His lordship repeated this command three times, and, it not being attended to, said, "Stop sir; I will have the Court cleared, there are persons talking louder at this moment than the Counsel. Officers, clear the Court of all but Counsel and attorneys immediately." In consequence of this peremptory order, the officers began unceremoniously to eject the audience: but after a time, the Lord Chancellor said, that the individuals at the sides of the Court might be allowed to remain, as it was not those within sight, but those that he could not see, that made all the noise. "Clear," continued his lordship, "the body of the hall, and that immediately." The hall was then cleared, and officers were stationed at the doors to prevent any persons from entering, but those who had business there.

---

### SEPTEMBER.

**A WILD MAN.**—A correspondent of the New York Courier, writing from Bath (N. H.), states that on the 2nd inst. while travelling five or six miles into the country, he encountered a wild man, in a state of perfect nudity, bronzed by the wind and sun, and leaping about the wood with all the playfulness of an ourang outang. When called to, he seemed frightened, and ran off, for the space of fifty yards. After showing himself on the edge of the

woods and among the tall bushes, he finally disappeared. He appeared to be about twenty-five years of age, and his movements indicated the possession of quiet and graceful strength. Subsequently it was ascertained that he was a harmless lunatic, who had wandered for years in the woods. When clothes are put upon him, he tears them off and escapes into the open air, and gambols about among the trees and shrubs.

**RELICS OF THE ABORIGINES OF CALEDONIA.**—While some men were digging peat, and clearing away part of the moss of Kincardine, they discovered at the bottom of the superincumbent moss, no less than ten feet below its surface, a number of oaken faggots charred at the ends, and arranged in a circle, in the centre of which a fire had been at some remote time kindled. These faggots had been cleft, and there were marks of edge-tools upon their exterior ends. Near to this ancient fireplace, was found a shield or target, wonderfully preserved. It had consisted of a circular oaken board, covered with hide, and secured by thongs through apertures perforated in the board, at regular distances. Fragments of the thongs were distinctly discernible. Lastly, were discovered some weapons of brass, edged like chisels, and having grooves for handles; and a hatchet of a very singular kind, also of brass, or some such metal. An ornamented pike of brass, curiously engraved, was also found.

**SLAVE CONSPIRACY.**—An alarming conspiracy was discovered among the black population in the slave states in America. On Sunday, the 4th inst., the first information of the contemplated rising of the blacks was sent from South Washington. The disclosure wa



made by a free mulatto man to Mr. Usher, of Washington, who sent the information to Mr. Kelly, of Duplin. It appears from the mulatto's testimony, that Dave, a slave belonging to Mr. Morissey, of Sampson, applied to him to join the conspirators; stating that the negroes in Sampson, Duplin, and New Hanover, were regularly organized and prepared to rise on the 4th of October. Dave was taken up, and on this testimony convicted. After his conviction, he made a confession of the above to his master, and, in addition, gave the names of the principal ringleaders, and named several families whom they intended to murder. Their object was to march by two routes to Wilmington, spreading destruction and murder on their way. At Wilmington they expected to be reinforced by 2000 men, and supply themselves with arms and ammunition. Dave and another of the ringleaders in Duplin were executed. There were twenty-three negroes in gaol in Duplin county, besides several who had been whipped. In Sampson there were twenty-five in gaol. The excitement among the people in Sampson was very great, and they were taking effectual measures to arrest all suspected persons. A very intelligent negro preacher, named David, was put on his trial, and clearly convicted by the testimony of another negro. The people were so much enraged, that they scarcely could be prevented from shooting him on his passage from the courthouse to the gaol. The confessions made induced the belief that the conspirators were organized, and their plans well understood in Duplin, Sampson, Waine, New Hanover, and Lenoir. Twenty-one negroes had been imprisoned

in Edenton, N. C., on a charge of being concerned in a project of rebellion. Edenton is 100 miles from Southampton county, the scene of the insurrection in Virginia, and nearly 200 miles from Duplin and Sampson counties, in North Carolina. The almost contemporaneous out-breaking of the insurrectionary spirit, in places so distant from each other, was deemed the most alarming feature in the whole affair.

CORONATION OF WILLIAM IV AND THE QUEEN.—As the door of Westminster Abbey was the place where their majesties were to alight from their carriages, it was found desirable to erect some retiring rooms. They consisted of a tall pointed arch, between two gables each rising over a window composed of two wide lancet lights. The archway opened immediately into a gallery or passage seventy feet long by nineteen wide, which was prepared in imitation of stone, a high wainscoting of oak, and a cieling in oak panels. The apartment for the king was on the right, and that for the queen on the left, each being entered through a small antichamber. Along the nave was extended a platform, twenty feet in width, covered with matting, and the centre with blue cloth. The side ailes were wholly filled with two galleries, supported on flat pointed arches, the fronts of which were exceedingly well coloured to harmonize with the general tint of the building. Seats were also erected in the vaultings, or nunneries, above the side ailes, and, as they projected in front of the arches (which had not been the case on any former occasion), they appeared suspended in mid-air. All these were let to the public, having been erected by individual



speculators, on contract with the Dean and Chapter. As the organ of the Abbey was to remain in its usual situation, it was considered desirable to raise the organ screen, in order that the performance of the vocal and instrumental musicians might not be lost in the vast space. On the new stone screen, was raised a wooden erection of about the same height, so as to inclose the music within the choir: and the front next the nave was painted to harmonise with the stone-work. From the choir all the stalls and reading-desks were removed, and the platform was continued down the centre, while five rows of seats were raised on each side for the reception of the judges, the knights of the Bath, the aldermen of London, and some of those who took part in the procession. Above these were two other galleries, one even with the organ-loft, and the other above, to which admission was given by tickets from the earl Marshal. At the north-east corner was the box of the lord great chamberlain. An ascent of seven steps led from the choir to the theatre, which is the name given to the space in the centre of the church, at the intersection of the choir and transepts. In the middle of this space were placed the two thrones—that of the king elevated on five steps, and the queen's on three, and both covered with cloth of gold. In the transepts, the first ten benches on the north were apportioned to peeresses, and the first ten on the south to peers; those behind were allotted to the holders of peers and peeresses' tickets; on each side were galleries, and under the great windows galleries were raised aloft, which were approached from the vaultings, much more

accommodation being thus provided than on any previous occasion. The number of privileged seats was calculated at 5,300. The peers who attended were each allowed three tickets, and others were distributed to the privy councillors, knights of the Bath, &c. in various proportions. The area (the space between the theatre and the altar, in which the coronation took place) was wholly hung with purple and gold silk, the pulpit and a bench for the bishops being placed on the north side, and in a recess on the south, a box, hung with crimson, and crowned with a guilt cornice, for the princesses, and towards the altar, a table for the regalia. In the centre stood the coronation chair; near the south-west pillar, opposite the pulpit, were a chair and faldstool for the queen's use in the early part of the ceremonies; and at the altar, a chair and faldstool for the archbishop. Above the altar was the gallery for the House of Commons, of which 410 members were present, the Speaker with his emblems of office, being seated in a state chair in the centre. The house met at half-after eight, and repaired to the Abbey at nine, in the order in which the counties were drawn by lot from the glasses. Three-fourths of the members were dressed in military uniforms, or in that of deputy-lieutenants of counties, and there were at least four in the Highland costume. Above the princesses, on the south, was the king's own gallery; and opposite to it, on the north, was the gallery for the Foreign ministers.

On the 8th of September, the Abbey, from the earliest dawn, presented the bustle incident to the approaching ceremony. Labourers, dressed in scarlet jackets and white



trowsers, were employed to complete the necessary arrangements. The pages of the earl Marshal, about forty in number, were in attendance to conduct the privileged visitors to their seats. They were gentlemen who volunteered their services, and were attired in a fancy costume, provided at their own expense, consisting of dark blue frock-coats, white breeches and stockings, a crimson silk sash, and a small squash hat, adorned with black ostrich feathers. Each was provided with a gold staff, bearing the arms of the earl Marshal. The heralds were also in attendance, to marshal the procession and precede it. Companies of the Grenadier and Coldstream Guards lined the platform on each side the nave. Soon after five o'clock a royal salute was fired by a detachment of artillery which was stationed in the Green Park; and about six, the whole of the household troops arrived in St. James's Park, and were thence distributed along the line of procession; some of the bands remaining to amuse the crowds in the Park. Along the whole line of route, scaffolds and galleries were occasionally erected over the areas and open spaces; in Parliament-street they were placed before nearly every house. The church-yard of St. Margaret's and the open spaces opposite were entirely covered. Besides the line of the royal procession, there were three dis-

ting routes to the different doors of the Abbey. That for the peers and others entering by the west door began at Grosvenor-place and approached by Tothill-street; that for Poets'-corner began at Knightsbridge, and approached by Milbank; that for the north door began at the Hay-market, and approached by King-street. The members of the House of Commons were permitted to take their ordinary route by Parliament-street, but were set down at the door of Westminster-hall. A covered platform was erected for their accommodation across the street to Poets'-corner. The carriages were all moved off to distinct places of rendezvous; and the strong barriers which were erected at every avenue of approach, by preventing a confluence of carriages near the line of the royal procession, enabled a vast number of spectators on foot to witness it with little difficulty. The state carriages of the Lord Chancellor and of the lord mayor of London, with their attendants, each formed a minor procession; and the equipages of prince Esterhazy, the Austrian Ambassador, were in themselves a splendid show. The carriages, horsemen, and attendants destined to form the street procession, met at Constitution-hill, and at half-past ten o'clock the cavalcade moved forward in the following order:

#### A Squadron of Life Guards.

The two carriages of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Gloucester, each drawn by six horses, with their proper escort of Life Guards. In the first were Lord Viscount Deerehurst, Lord Edward Thynne, Major-Gen. Sir Howard Douglas, Bart., and Lieut.-Col. Edmund Currey. In the second, their Royal Highnesses, attended by Lady Isabella Thynne.

The two carriages of her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge,



each drawn by six horses, with the proper escort of Life Guards. In the first were Lord Viscount Villiers, and Colonel Sir James Henry Reynett, K.C.H. In the second, her Royal Highness, attended by Lady Elizabeth Murray.

The carriage of his Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, drawn by six horses, with his proper escort of Life Guards, in which were his Royal Highness, attended by Lord John-Spencer Churchill, Lieut.-Gen. Sir William Hutchinson, and Capt. the Hon. Edward Gore.

The two carriages of their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Cumberland, each drawn by six horses, with their proper escort of Life Guards. In the first were Lord Viscount Encombe, Lord Ernest Bruce, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Colquhoun Grant, K.C.B., and Lieut.-Gen. John Slade. And in the second, their Royal Highnesses, attended by Lady Sophia Lennox.

The King's Barge-Master, and the King's forty-eight Watermen.

TEN CARRIAGES OF THEIR MAJESTIES, each drawn by six horses, and attended by four Grooms on foot.

A Squadron of Life Guards.

His Majesty's Equerries and Aides-de-Camp, on horseback, two and two (each attended by a Groom, and the King's two Yeomen Riders on either side).

The Deputy Adjutant-general, Major-Gen. John Gardiner; the Deputy Quartermaster-general, Major-gen. Sir Richard D. Jackson, K.C.B.; and the Deputy Adjutant-general of the Royal Artillery, Colonel Sir Alexander Dickson, K.C.B.

The Quartermaster-general, Lieut.-Gen. the Right Hon. Sir James W. Gordon, bt., K.C.B.; the Adjutant-General, Major-Gen. John Macdonald; and Major-Gen. Lord Fitzroy Somerset, K.C.B., Military Secretary to the General commanding in Chief.

The Master of his Majesty's Buck-hounds, Lord Viscount Anson, on horseback, attended by two Grooms.

Six of his Majesty's horses, with rich trappings, each horse led by two Grooms.

George Head, Esq. Deputy Knight Marshal.

Marshmen in ranks of four.

The Exons and Clerk of the Cheque of the Yeomen of the Guard.

One hundred Yeomen of the Guard, four and four.

The Lieutenant and Ensign of the Yeomen of the Guard, John Gill, Esq., and William-Conyngham Burton, Esq. on horseback.

Twelve Footmen, four and four.

The STATE COACH, drawn by eight horses, attended by a Yeoman of the Guard at each wheel and two Footmen at each door, and the horses on either side by four Grooms; the Gold Stick, Gen. Lord Viscount Combermere, G.C.B., and the Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, the Marquess of Clanricarde, riding on either side, attended by two Grooms each; conveying

HIS MAJESTY THE KING: HER MAJESTY THE QUEEN, attended by the Duchess of Gordon, in the absence of the Duchess-dowager of Leeds, Mistress of the Robes, and the Countess Brownlow, Lady of the Bedchamber in waiting.

A Squadron of Life Guards.



The procession, which was under the orders of Lord Frederick Fitzclarence, Gentleman of the Horse to his Majesty, assisted by Ralph W. Spearman, esq. Chief Clerk of the Stables, and the other officers of the Master of the Horse's Department, proceeded by the route of Pall-mall, Charing-cross, Whitehall, and Parliament-street, and arrived at the great west entrance of Westminster Abbey, at a quarter past eleven o'clock.

The Great Officers of State, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, the noblemen appointed to carry the Regalia (all in their respective robes of estate), and the Bishops who were to support their Majesties, as well as those who were to carry the Bible, the Chalice, and the Patina, assembled in the Jerusalem chamber, adjoining the Deanery, before ten o'clock, where the Regalia, having been previously laid on the table, were delivered by the Lord Chamberlain of the Household to the Lord High Constable, by him to the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, and by his lordship to the noblemen by whom the same were severally to be borne. The Dean and Prebendaries of

Westminster were in the Nave, in readiness to join the procession next before the Officers of his Majesty's Household.

On the arrival of their Majesties at the Abbey, at a quarter past eleven o'clock, they were received by the Great Officers of State and the Noblemen bearing the Regalia, and repaired to their robing-chambers without the west entrance. The Ladies of her Majesty's Household, the Officers of the Royal Household, and of the respective Households of the Princes and Princesses, as well as others who had formed part of the royal retinue from St. James's Palace, and to whom duties had not been assigned in the solemnity, passed immediately to the places prepared for them within the Choir.

Their Majesties, having been robed, advanced up the Nave into the Choir; the Choristers of the Chapel Royal, of Westminster, and of St. Paul's, in the orchestra, under the direction of Sir George Smart, kt., organist of his Majesty's Chapels Royal, sang the anthem, "I was glad when they said unto me, we will go into the House of the Lord," &c.

#### PROCEEDING FROM THE ABBEY DOOR INTO THE CHOIR.

Pursuivants of Arms, in their tabards.

Blanch Lyon Extr., G. H. Rogers    Rouge Croix, Rob. Laurie, Gent.  
Harrison, Gent.

Portcullis, James Pulman, Esq.    Rouge Dragon, F. Townsend, Gent.

Heralds of Arms, in their tabards and Collars of SS.

Arundel Extry. W. A. Blount, Esq.	Norfolk Extr. Wm. Woods, Esq.
Lancaster, Geo.-Fred. Beltz, Esq.	York, Chas.-Geo. Young, Esq.
Windsor, Francis Martin, Esq.	Somerset, J. Cathrow Disney, Esq.
Richmond, Joseph Hawker, Esq.	Chester, Geo.-Martin Leake, Esq.

Kings of Arms, in their tabards and Collars of SS.,

bearing their Crowns :

Norroy, Edmund Lodge, Esq.    Clarenceux, Ralph Bigland, Esq.  
Prebendaries of Westminster, viz., Lord John Thynne, Henry Vincent Bayley, D.D., George Holcombe, D.D., James Webber, D.D., Dean of Ripon and Sub-Dean of Westminster, Joseph Allen, D.D., and Thomas Causton, D.D.



The Dean of Westminster, John Ireland, D.D.

His Majesty's Vice-Chamberlain, the Earl of Belfast.

Comptroller of his Majesty's  
Household, Right Hon. Robert  
Grosvenor.

Treasurer of his Majesty's House-  
hold, Right Hon. Sir Wm. H.  
Freemantle, G.C.H., bearing the  
crimson bag with the medals.

The Lord Chamberlain of the  
Household,  
the Duke of Devonshire, K.G. ;  
his coronet carried by a Page,  
and attended by an  
Officer of the Jewel-office,  
Thomas B. Marsh, Esq.,  
bearing a cushion, with two  
Ruby Rings, and the  
Sword for the Offering.

The Lord Steward of the  
Household,  
the Earl of Shaftesbury ;  
(in the absence of the  
Marquess of Wellesley, K.G. ;)   
his coronet carried by a Page.

The Lord Privy Seal,  
Lord Durham ;  
his coronet carried by a Page.

The Lord President of the Council,  
Marquess of Lansdowne ;  
his coronet carried by a Page.

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland, Lord Plunket ;  
attended by his Purse-bearer, his coronet carried by a Page.

The Lord High Chancellor, Lord Brougham and Vaux ;  
attended by his Purse-bearer, his coronet carried by a Page.

The Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, William Howley, D.D., in his  
rochet, with his cap in his hand, attended by two Gentlemen.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cambridge,  
in a robe of estate of purple velvet, wearing a circlet of gold on  
her head ; her train borne by Lady Elizabeth Murray,  
assisted by Col. Sir James-Henry Reynett ;  
and her coronet by Lord Viscount Villiers.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Cumberland,  
in a like robe and circlet ; her train borne by Lady Sophia Lennox,  
assisted by Sir Colquhoun Grant ;  
and her coronet by Lord Viscount Encombe.

Her Royal Highness the Duchess of Gloucester,  
in a like robe and circlet ; her train borne by Lady Isabella Thynne,  
assisted by Lieut.-Col. Edmund Currey ;  
and her coronet by Lord Viscount Deerhurst.

The Queen's Vice Chamberlain,  
Lord Viscount Valletort, in the absence of the Hon. William Ashley.

THE QUEEN'S REGALIA, viz.,

The Ivory Rod  
with the  
Dove, borne by  
Earl Cawdor ;  
Two Serjeants  
at  
Arms.

The Lord Chamberlain of her  
Majesty's Household,  
Earl Howe ;  
their coronet each carried by a Page.  
Her Majesty's Crown,  
borne by the Duke of Beaufort, K.G. ;  
his Grace's coronet carried by a Page.

The Sceptre  
with the Cross,  
borne by the  
Earl of Jersey ;  
Two Serjeants  
at  
Arms.



## THE QUEEN,

The Bishop of Winchester, Charles Richard Sumner, D.D.	in her Royal Robes, with her Circle of Gold ; her Majesty's Train borne by the Duchess of Gordon, in the absence of the dowager Duchess of Leeds, Mistress of the Robes, assisted by six Daughters of Earls, viz. :	The Bishop of Chichester, Robert James Carr, D.D.
Lady Georgiana Bathurst.	Lady Teresa Fox-Strangways.	
Lady Mary Pelham.	Lady Theodosia Brabazon.	
Lady Sophia Cust.	Lady Georgiana Grey.	

On each side of her Majesty walked five Gentlemen Pensioners.

Ladies of the Bedchamber in Waiting, viz. :

Countess Brownlow. Marchioness of Westmeath.

Maids of Honour, viz. :

Hon. Miss Eden, Hon. Miss Bagot, Hon. Miss de Roos,  
Hon. Miss C. Boyle, Hon. Miss Seymour, and Hon. Miss Mitchell.

Women of the Bedchamber, viz. :

Lady Caroline Wood. Lady William Russell.

## THE KING'S REGALIA, viz. :

St. Edward's Staff, borne by the Duke of Grafton ;	The Golden Spurs, borne by the Marquess of Hastings ;	The Sceptre with the Cross, borne by the Duke of St. Albans ;
their coronets each carried by a Page.		
The Third Sword, borne by the Marquess of Cleveland ;	Curtana, borne by the Marquess of Salisbury ;	The Second Sword, borne by the Marquess of Downshire ;
their coronets each carried by a Page.		
Gentlemen Usher of the Black Rod, Sir Thomas Tyrwhitt, kt. K.S.A.	Garter Principal King of Arms, Sir Geo. Nayler, kt. K.H., C.T.S. his crown borne by a Page.	

The Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain of England,  
Marquess of Cholmondeley ; his coronet borne by a Page.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Gloucester,  
in his robes of estate, carrying his baton as Field-Marshal,  
his coronet borne by Major-Gen. Sir Howard Douglas, Bart.,  
his train by Lord Edward Thynne.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Sussex, in like robes ;  
his coronet carried by Lieut.-Gen. Sir William Hutchinson, kt. ;  
his train by Lord John-Spencer Churchill.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland, in like robes,  
carrying his baton ; his coronet borne by Lieut.-Gen. John Slade ;  
his train by Lord Ernest Bruce.

The High Constable of Ireland, the Duke of Leinster ; his coronet borne by a Page.	The High Constable of Scotland, the Earl of Erroll ; his coronet borne by a Page.
--	---



The Earl Marshal of  
England,  
the Duke of Norfolk,  
with his staff;  
attended by two Pages.

The Sword of State,  
borne by  
Earl Grey, K.G. ;  
his coronet  
carried by a Page.

The Lord High  
Constable of England,  
the Duke of Wel-  
lington, K.G. ; with  
his staff, and his  
baton as Field-Marshal ;  
attended by two Pages.

The Sceptre with the  
Dove,  
borne by the  
Duke of Richmond,  
K.G. ; his coronet  
carried by a Page.

St. Edward's Crown,  
borne by the  
Lord High Steward,  
the Duke of Hamilton ;  
his staff and his coronet  
carried by two Pages.

The Orb, borne  
by the  
Duke of Somerset ;  
his coronet  
carried by a Page.

The Patina,  
borne by the  
Bishop of Rochester,  
George Murray, D.D.

The Bible,  
borne by the  
Bishop of Exeter,  
Henry Philpotts, D.D.

The Chalice,  
borne by the  
Bishop of Oxford,  
Hon. Rich. Bagot, D.D.

The Bishop  
of  
Bath and Wells,  
Geo.-Henry Law, D.D.

THE KING,  
in his Royal crimson  
Robes, and  
Cap of State ;  
his Majesty's train  
borne by

The Archbishop of York,  
Edw. Harcourt, D.C.L.  
in the absence of the  
Bishop of Durham.

the Marquess of Worcester, the Earl of Euston,  
the Earl of Kerry, the Marquess of Titchfield, the Marquess of Douro,  
assisted by the Master of the Robes,  
Capt. Sir Geo. Seymour, K.C.H. ;  
and followed by the Groom of the Robes,  
Capt. Lord Adolphus Fitzclarence, R.N.

On each side walked ten Gentlemen Pensioners,\* those on the King's  
right hand headed by their Lieutenant, H. B. Henrich, Esq.,  
and those on his Majesty's left hand by their Standard-bearer,  
Sir George-Bartholomew Pocock, kt.

Groom of the Stole, Gold Stick of the Life Master of the Horse,  
Marquess of Winchester; Guards in waiting, Earl of Albemarle ;  
Gen. Lord Viscount  
Combermere, G.C.B. ;  
their coronets each borne by a Page.

The Captain of the Yeomen  
of the Guard,  
Marquess of Clanricarde ;  
his coronet borne by a Page.

The Captain of the Band of  
Gentlemen Pensioners,  
Lord Foley ;  
his coronet borne by a Page.

The Captain of the Archer-Guard of Scotland,  
Duke of Buccleugh, K.T. ; his coronet borne by a Page.

---

\* Instead of wearing the costume of the time of Henry 8th, adopted at the former coronation, the Gentlemen Pensioners were attired in the full-dress uniform of Officers of the Guards, with cocked hat and feathers.



The Master of his Majesty's Buck-hounds, Lord Viscount Anson ;  
his coronet borne by a Page.

Two Lords of the Bedchamber, viz. :  
Earl Amherst, and the Earl of Denbigh ;  
each attended by a Page to bear his coronet.

The Keeper of his Majesty's Privy Purse,  
Major-General Sir H. Wheatley, K.C.H.

Exons of the Yeomen of the Guard, Henry Cipriani, esq., T. H. Curteis, esq.	Clerk of the Cheque to the Yeomen of the Guard, R. F. Fitzherbert, esq.	Exons of the Yeomen of the Guard, Charles Hancock, esq. John Hancock, esq.
--	--	---

Twenty Yeomen of the Guard.

[The Knights of the several Orders wore their respective collars.]

The Prebendaries, entering the choir, ascended the theatre, and passed over it to their station on the south side of the altar, beyond the King's chair. — The Vice-Chamberlain, Comptroller, and Treasurer of his Majesty's Household, passed to the seats provided for them. — The Dean of Westminster, the Great Officers, and the Lord Archbishop of Canterbury, ascended the theatre, and stood near the great south-east pillar thereof. — The Princesses and the attendants of their Royal Highnesses were conducted by the Officers of Arms to their box on the south side of the area.

The Queen, preceded by her Majesty's Vice-Chamberlain, Lord Chamberlain, and the noblemen bearing her Regalia, and attended as before mentioned, ascended the theatre, and passed on the north side of her throne, to the chair of state provided for her Majesty on the east side of the theatre, below her throne, and stood by the said chair until his Majesty's arrival. — The Serjeants-at-Arms went to their places, near the theatre. — The Gentlemen Pensioners, who guarded their Majesties, remained at the foot of the steps ascending the theatre: the Yeomen of the

Guard stood on the outside of the entrance to the choir.

The Princes of the Blood Royal were conducted to their seats, as Peers, by the Officers of Arms. — The High Constables of Scotland and Ireland were also conducted to their places, as Peers.

The King, ascending the theatre, passed, on the south side of his throne, to his chair of state on the east side of the theatre, opposite to the altar; and their Majesties, after their private devotions, took their respective seats; the Bishops, their supporters, standing on each side; the Noblemen bearing the four Swords on his Majesty's right hand; the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, and the Lord High Constable on his left; the Great Officers of State, the Noblemen bearing his Majesty's Regalia, the Dean of Westminster, Garter, and Black Rod, standing about the King's chair, and the Trainbearers behind his Majesty. — The Gold Stick, the Master of the Horse, the Groom of the Stole, the Captain of the Band of Gentlemen Pensioners, the Captain of the Yeomen of the Guard, and the Captain of the Archer-Guard of Scotland, passed to their seats, as Peers. — The Queen's Officers, the Noblemen



who bore her Majesty's Regalia, her Supporters, Trainbearers, and Assistants, stood near her Majesty; her Lord Chamberlain on the right hand; her Vice-Chamberlain on the left; and the Ladies-Attendants behind her Majesty's chair.

*The Recognition.*—Upon the conclusion of the anthem, his Majesty, attended by the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Lord Chancellor, the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, the Lord High Constable, and the Earl Marshal, and preceded by Garter, repaired to the east side of the theatre, where the Archbishop made the Recognition, and repeated the same at the south, west, and north sides of the theatre, his Majesty turning towards the people on the side at which the Recognition was made: the people replied to each demand with loud and repeated acclamations of "God save King William the Fourth;" and, at the last Recognition, the trumpets sounded and the drums beat.

His Majesty then took his seat, and the Bible, the Chalice, and the Patina were carried to and placed upon the altar by the Bishops who had borne them.—Two Officers of the Wardrobe then spread a rich cloth of gold, and laid two cushions on the same, for their Majesties to kneel on, at the steps of the altar.—The Archbishop of Canterbury put on his cope, and the Bishops who were to read the litany were also vested in their copes.

*The Offering.*—The King, attended by his Supporters, and the Dean of Westminster, the Great Officers, the Noblemen bearing the Regalia and the four Swords, going before his Majesty, passed to the altar. Then the Queen,

supported and preceded by the Noblemen bearing her Majesty's Regalia as before, went also to the altar. His Majesty, uncovered and kneeling upon the cushion, made his first offering of a pall or altar-cloth of gold, which was delivered by an officer of the Wardrobe to the Lord Chamberlain, by his Grace to the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, and by him to the King, who delivered it to the Archbishop of Canterbury, by whom it was placed on the altar. The Treasurer of the Household then delivered an ingot of gold, of one pound weight, being the second offering, to the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, who having presented the same to the King, his Majesty delivered it to the Archbishop, by whom it was put into the oblation basin.

The Queen, kneeling on the left hand of his Majesty, made her offering, namely, a pall of gold, with the like ceremony. Their Majesties continued to kneel, and the prayer, "O God, who dwellest in the high and holy place," was said by the Archbishop. At the conclusion of the prayer, their Majesties rose. The King was conducted to the chair of state on the south side of the area, and her Majesty to the chair on the left hand of the King. The Regalia, except the Swords, were delivered, by the several Noblemen who bore the same, to the Archbishop, and by his Grace to the Dean of Westminster, who laid them on the altar; the Great Officers, and the Noblemen who had borne the Regalia, going to their respective places.

The litany was then read by the Bishop of Lichfield and Coventry, and Bishop of Lincoln, vested in copes, and kneeling at a fald-



stool covered with blue velvet, placed above the steps of the theatre, in the middle of its east side. Then was read the beginning of the communion service, the Bishop of Llandaff reading the Epistle, and the Bishop of Bristol the Gospel. The sermon was preached by the Bishop of London, his text was from 1 Peter ii, 18, "Submit yourself to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake," a passage which had just been read in the Epistle. During the sermon, his Majesty wore his cap of state of crimson velvet, turned up with ermine, and sat in his chair on the south side of the area, opposite the pulpit; his Supporters, the Deputy Great Chamberlain, and the Noblemen carrying the Swords, standing by him. Her Majesty sat in her chair on the left hand of his Majesty, supported and attended as before. The Archbishop of Canterbury took his seat in a purple velvet chair, on the north side of the altar, Garter standing near him. The Dean took his seat on the south side of the altar. The Bishops sat on their benches, along the north side of the area. The Prebendaries of Westminster stood on the south side of the area, east of the King's chair, and near the altar.

*The Oath.*—The sermon being ended, the Archbishop of Canterbury, advancing to the King, administered the Coronation Oath. The King arose from his chair of state, and, attended by his supporters and the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, went uncovered to the altar, where, kneeling upon the cushion laid on the steps, and placing his hand on the Holy Gospels, his Majesty took the Oath, and added thereto his royal sign manual, the Lord Chamberlain of

the Household holding a silver standish for that purpose, delivered to him by an officer of the Jewel-office.

The King returned to his chair, when the hymn was sung, (the Archbishop reading the first line,) "Come, Holy Ghost, our souls inspire," &c.

*The Anointing.*—Upon the conclusion of the hymn, the Archbishop read the prayer preparatory to the Anointing, "O Lord, Holy Father, who by anointing with oil didst of old make and consecrate Kings, Priests, and Prophets," &c. At the conclusion of this prayer, the choirs sang the anthem, "Zadock the priest," &c. During this, the King was disrobed of his crimson robes by the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, who delivered them to the Master of the Robes; and his Majesty took off his cap of state, the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain delivering the same to the Lord Chamberlain; and the robes and cap were immediately carried into St. Edward's Chapel, the robes by the Groom of the Robes, the cap by the officer of the Jewel office. His Majesty then took his seat in King Edward's chair, covered with cloth of gold, and placed in front of the altar, when four Knights of the Garter, viz. the Dukes of Leeds and Dorset, the Marquess Camden, and the Marquess of Exeter, summoned by Garter, held over the King's head a rich pall or cloth of gold, delivered to them by the Lord Chamberlain, who had received the same from an officer of the Wardrobe; and the Dean of Westminster stood near holding the Ampulla, containing the consecrated oil, and pouring some into the Anointing Spoon, the Archbishop anointed his Majesty on



the head and hands, in the form of a cross, pronouncing the words, "Be thou anointed," &c.

The King then kneeling, the Archbishop standing on the north side of the altar, pronounced the Benediction. The Knights of the Garter returned the pall to the Lord Chamberlain (which was by him re-delivered to the officer of the Wardrobe), and repaired to their seats.

*The Spurs.*—After this, the Dean took the Spurs from the altar, and delivered them to the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain, who, kneeling down, touched his Majesty's heels therewith, and returned them to the Dean, by whom they were laid upon the altar.

*The Sword.*—Earl Grey then delivered the Sword of State to the Lord Chamberlain, and, in lieu thereof, received from his Grace another Sword in a scabbard of purple velvet (presented to his Grace by an officer of the Jewel-office), which his Lordship delivered to the Archbishop, who laid it on the altar, and said the prayer, "Hear our prayers, O Lord, we beseech thee, and so direct and support thy servant King William," &c.

The Archbishop then took the Sword from off the altar, and, assisted by other Bishops, delivered it into the King's right hand, saying, "Receive this kingly Sword," &c. and "With this Sword do Justice," &c.

*Offering of the Sword.*—The King rising, went to the altar, where his Majesty offered the Sword in the scabbard, (delivering it to the Archbishop), and then retired to his chair: the Sword was then redeemed by Earl Grey, who carried it during the remain-

der of the solemnity, having first drawn it out of the scabbard, and delivered the latter to an officer of the Wardrobe.

*The Investing with the Mantle.*

—The King then standing, his Majesty was invested by the Dean with the Imperial Mantle, or Dalmatic Robe of cloth of gold, delivered to him by the officers of the Wardrobe; the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain fastening the clasps.

*The Orb.*—The King then sitting down, the Archbishop, having received the Orb from the Dean, delivered it into the King's right hand, saying, "Receive this imperial Robe and Orb," &c. His Majesty then returned the Orb to the Dean, who laid it upon the altar.

*The Ring.*—The Lord Chamberlain of his Majesty's Household, then receiving from the officer of the Jewel office the Ruby Ring, delivered the same to the Archbishop, who put it on the fourth finger of the King's right hand, saying "Receive this Ring," &c.

*The Sceptres.*—The Dean thereupon brought from the altar the two Sceptres with the Cross and Dove, and delivered them to the Archbishop. In the meantime, the Duke of Norfolk, as Lord of the Manor of Worksop, presented to the King a glove, for his Majesty's right hand, embroidered with the arms of Howard, which his Majesty put on. The Archbishop then delivered the Sceptre with the Cross into his Majesty's right hand, saying, "Receive the Royal Sceptre" &c.; and then the Sceptre with the Dove into his left hand saying, "Receive the Rod of Equity," &c. The Duke of Norfolk, as Lord of the Manor of



Worksop, supported his Majesty's right arm, and held the Sceptre as occasion required.

*The Crowning.* — The Archbishop, standing before the altar, and having St. Edward's Crown before him, took the same into his hands, and consecrated and blessed it, saying the prayer, "O God, who crownest thy faithful servants with mercy," &c. Then the Archbishop, assisted by other Bishops, came from the altar, the Dean of Westminster carrying the Crown, which the Archbishop took and placed on his Majesty's head: while the people, with loud and repeated shouts, cried, "God save the King," &c.: the trumpets sounding, the drums beating, and the Tower and Park guns firing by signal. The acclamation ceasing, the Archbishop pronounced the exhortation, "Be strong and of a good courage," &c. The choirs then sang the anthem, "The King shall rejoice in thy strength," &c. As soon as the King was crowned, the Princes of the Blood Royal and the other peers put on their coronets; the Bishops their Caps; and the Kings of Arms their crowns.

*The Holy Bible.* — The Dean then taking the Holy Bible from the altar, delivered it to the Archbishop, who, attended by the rest of the Bishops, presented it to the King, saying, "Our Gracious King," &c. The King then returned the Bible to the Archbishop, who gave it to the Dean, and it was by him replaced on the altar. The Archbishop then pronounced the Benedictions, the Bishops and the Peers answering each Benediction with a loud Amen. The Archbishop then turning to the people, said, "And the same Lord God Almighty grant," &c. Te Deum was there-

upon sung, during which time the King removed to the chair on which his Majesty first sat on the east side of the throne.

*The Inthronization.* — Te Deum being ended, the King ascended the theatre, and was enthroned by the Bishops and Peers: the Archbishop pronounced the Exhortation, "Stand firm, and hold fast," &c.

*The Homage.* — His Majesty seated on his throne, then delivered the Sceptre with the Cross to the Duke of Norfolk, to hold the same on his right hand, and the Sceptre with the Dove to the Duke of Richmond, to hold the same on his left hand, during the Homage. The Archbishop of Canterbury then knelt before the King, and, for himself and the fifteen other Lords Spiritual then present, pronounced the words of Homage, they kneeling around him, and saying, after him. The Archbishop then kissed his Majesty's left cheek, and the rest of the Lords Spiritual did the same, and retired. The like ceremony was then performed by his Royal Highness the Duke of Cumberland and Teviotdale, and the two other Princes of the Blood Royal then present: by Bernard-Edward, Duke of Norfolk, and fifteen other Dukes; by Charles Ingoldesby, Marquess of Winchester and seventeen other Marquesses; by John Earl of Shrewsbury, and sixty other Earls; by Henry Viscount Hereford, and nine other Viscounts; and by Henry-William Lord de Roos, and fifty-seven other Barons. During the ceremony, the choir sang an anthem, and the Treasurer of his Majesty's Household threw about the Medals of the Coronation.

*The Anointing, Crowning, and Enthroning of the Queen.* — Her



Majesty the Queen having reposed herself in her chair on the south side of the altar, during the Coronation and Inthronization of his Majesty, arose as soon as the anthem was ended, and, being supported as before, went to the altar, attended by her Trainbearer, and Ladies-assistants; and her Majesty knelt whilst the Archbishop said the prayer of consecration. Her Majesty then rose and went to the Chair, at which she was to be anointed and crowned, and which was placed on the left of King Edward's Chair, somewhat nearer to the altar; and standing there, the Countess Brownlow took off her Majesty's circle of gold, and delivered it to her Lord Chamberlain. The Queen then knelt down, and the Duchesses of Richmond, Montrose, and Northumberland, and the Marchioness of Lansdowne, having been summoned by Garter, severally left their places and repaired to the area, where, holding a rich pall of cloth of gold over her Majesty, the Archbishop poured the consecrated oil upon her head, saying, "In the name of the Father," &c. Then the Archbishop received, from the officer of the Jewel-office, the Queen's Ring, and put the same on the fourth finger of her Majesty's right hand, saying, "Receive this Ring." &c. The Archbishop thereupon took the Crown from the altar, and reverently set it on the Queen's head, saying, "Receive the Crown," &c. Her Majesty being crowned, the three Princesses of the Blood Royal and all the dowager Peeresses, and Peeresses present put on their coronets. There were in number seven Duchesses, thirteen Marchionesses, twenty-nine Countesses,

five Viscountesses, and thirty-one Baronesses.

Then the Archbishop placed the Sceptre with the Cross in her Majesty's right hand, and the Ivory Rod with the Dove in her left, and offered up the prayer, "O Lord, the giver of all perfection," &c. The Queen, being thus anointed, and crowned, and having, received all her ornaments, the choirs sang the Hallelujah Chorus; at the commencement of the chorus the Queen arose, and, supported as before, ascended the theatre (reverently bowing to his Majesty as she passed the throne) and was conducted to her own throne on the left hand of that of the King, where her Majesty reposed until the conclusion of the chorus.

*The Holy Sacrament.*—After the Chorus, the two Bishops, who had read the Epistle and Gospel, received from the altar, by the hands of the Archbishop, the Patina and the Chalice, which they carried into St. Edward's Chapel, and brought from thence the Bread upon the Patina, and the Wine in the Chalice, their Majesties then descended from their thrones, and went to the altar, where the King, taking off his Crown, delivered it to the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain to hold, and the Sceptres to the Dukes of Norfolk and Richmond. Then the Bishops delivered the Patina and Chalice into the King's hands; and his Majesty delivered them to the Archbishop, who reverently placed the same upon the altar, covering them with a fair linen cloth. The Queen also taking off her Crown, delivered it to her Lord Chamberlain to hold, and the Sceptres to those Noblemen who had previously borne them. Their



Majesties then went to their chairs. on the south side of the area. When the Archbishop and the Dean had communicated, their Majesties received the Sacrament, the Archbishop administering the Bread, and the Dean of Westminster the Cup. The King and Queen then put on their Crowns, and, taking the Sceptres in their hands as before, repaired again to their thrones, supported and attended as before. The Archbishop then read the Communion Service, and pronounced the blessing; and, at the conclusion, the trumpets sounded and the drums beat. After which, his Majesty, attended as before, the Four Swords being carried before him, descended into the area, and passed through the door on the south side of the altar, into St. Edward's Chapel; and the Noblemen who had carried the Regalia, received them from the Dean of Westminster as they passed by the altar into the Chapel. The Queen at the same time, descending from her throne, went into the same chapel at the door on the north side of the altar. Their Majesties being in the Chapel, the King, standing before the altar, delivered the Sceptre with the Dove, which his Majesty had borne in his left hand, to the Archbishop, who laid it upon the altar. His Majesty was then disrobed of his Royal Robe of State, or Dalmatic Robe, and arrayed in his Royal robe of purple velvet by the Deputy Lord Great Chamberlain. The Archbishop then placed the Orb in his Majesty's left hand. The Noblemen, who had carried the Gold Spurs, and St. Edward's Staff, delivered the same to the Dean, to be by him deposited on the altar. Whilst their Majesties

were in St. Edward's Chapel, the Officers of Arms, arranged the returning procession, which moved at the moment when the King and Queen left the Chapel. Their Majesties, and the Princes, and Princesses, then proceeded out of the Choir, and to the west door of the Abbey, attended as before; their Majesties wearing their Crowns; the King bearing in his right hand the Sceptre with the Cross, and in his left the Orb; and the Queen bearing in her right hand her Sceptre with the Cross, and in her left the Ivory Rod with the Dove: their Royal Highnesses the Princes and Princesses wearing their Coronets; and the Princes, who were Field-Mmarshals, carrying their batons. The Four Swords were borne before the King, in the same order as before. The Dean and Prebendaries, and the Bishops who had carried the Bible, the Chalice, and the Patina, remained in the Choir. The Noblemen who had severally carried the Crowns, the Orb, the Sceptre with the Dove, the Spurs, and St. Edward's Staff, walked in the same places as before; those Noblemen who had staves and batons carrying the same; all Peers wearing their coronets; and the Archbishops, and the Bishops supporting their Majesties, wearing their caps; and the Kings of Arms their crowns. On the arrival of their Majesties on the platform without the west entrance, Garter proclaimed his Majesty's Style, as follows:—"The Most High, Most Mighty, and Most Excellent Monarch, WILLIAM THE FOURTH, by the Grace of God, of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, King, Defender of the Faith: King of Hanover, Duke of Bruns-



wick and of Lunenburgh." The Swords and the Regalia were received in the Robing-chambers, by the officers of the Jewel-office appointed for that purpose. The ceremonies were concluded at about three o'clock, when their Majesties, and the Princes and Princesses of the Blood Royal, returned to St. James's Palace with the same state as in their proceeding to the Abbey. The Duchess of Kent and the Princess Victoria, in consequence of the delicate state of health of the latter, remained in retirement in the Isle of Wight. As the economy of the age did not allow his Majesty to give his Peers the usual coronation dinner in Westminster-hall, he privately entertained a large party at St. James's. Earl Grey gave a dinner to a numerous party of Peers; Lord Palmerston to the whole of the Foreign Ministers; Lord Althorp to the Governor of the Bank, the Chairman of the several financial boards, and many members of the House of Commons; and the Lord Mayor to the Aldermen and a numerous party. Throughout the metropolis the day was kept as a general holiday. All business was suspended, and the shops closed. The new entrance to St. James's Park from Carlton Terrace was opened for the first time. At about five o'clock Mr. and Mrs. Graham ascended from the Green Park in their balloon, which was visible to the inhabitants of the metropolis for a full hour. They descended safely at Heringate-hall, Essex, twenty-three miles from London. In the evening the metropolis was universally illuminated. There was a grand discharge of fire-works in Hyde-Park from nine to eleven o'clock; and Vauxhall and all the summer theatres

were opened gratuitously to the public.

12. SUICIDE OF JOHN CALCRAFT, M.P.—A Coroner's Inquest was held at the dwelling-house of John Calcraft, esq., late paymaster of the Forces, who committed suicide on Sunday last, while the family were at church. On the return of the unfortunate gentleman's daughter, from church, on Sunday afternoon, she went up to his bed-room, to seek her father; but not finding him, she went to his dressing-room, accompanied by the deceased's footman. On entering the room, they discovered Mr. Calcraft lying on the floor, with his face downward, in a complete pool of blood. Medical assistance was obtained, but life was quite gone. There was a wound across the throat, dividing the principal arteries, and laying bare the vertebræ of the neck. In his right hand was a bloody razor, which he still grasped firmly. The footman deposed to his having seen Mr. Calcraft quit his sitting-room, and proceed up stairs about three o'clock, without saying anything, after which he did not see him, till he accompanied his daughter to his bed-room. The deceased had been unwell for the last three months, during the two latter of which he had not quitted his residence, and appeared extremely low and dejected. Mr. Freeman, surgeon, of Spring-gardens, and Dr. Wilson Phillip had both attended the family for the last three months, and, observing the deceased to be labouring under great depression of spirits, which at length settled into deep melancholy, they had thought it their duty to caution captain Calcraft, who did not reside in the house, but who called occasionally, that the deceased



ought to be watched. Dr. Phillip was asked by one of the Jury, if Mr. Calcraft had ever expressed disappointment at not being elevated to the peerage; the Doctor answered that he did not believe he ever entertained any expectation of such an event. He had latterly fancied that he was continually watched by a man sitting on the top of a house. —The Jury returned a verdict of —Temporary Mental Derangement.

WHOLESALE MURDER.—(From the Chambersburg Republican, Sept. 13.)—One of the editors was in company with a gentleman on Wednesday last direct from Halifax, who stated that he had witnessed the trial of Henry Gambles, captain of the lady Sherbrooke, from Londonderry, shipwrecked near Cape Ray, on the 19th ult., by which 273 persons lost their lives. Captain Gambles was convicted of intentionally wrecking the ship to recover the insurance, and sentenced to be hanged; after which he confessed that he deserved the punishment. One of the witnesses, whose arm was broken, had lost his wife and a large family of children.

16. Thomas Wakeman and Elizabeth his wife, together with Joseph Lill, were jointly indicted for stealing on the 15th of July last, 16cwt. of printed paper, of the value of 1000*l.* and upwards, the property of Mr. Butterworth, a law-bookseller, in Fleet-street. —Brettell, the warehouseman to Mr. Butterworth, proved that, on the 15th of July, on inspecting his master's warehouse, in Apollo-court, he found three tons of printed paper had been abstracted, the value of which must exceed 3,000*l.* The paper traced to the prisoner Wakeman was part of the stock

so removed. Other witnesses proved, that, on the morning in question, one of the prisoners engaged a cart to carry the paper from the premises, and the other was assisting in removing it. The paper was found at Mr. Emblin's in Leather-lane and other places. Part of the stolen property was produced and identified by the warehouseman.—Wakeman, when called upon for his defence, said that he was innocent of any guilty participation in the transaction. He acted as an agent to a person of the name of Bowyer, who had not been taken; he was to have a commission on the sale of half-a-crown per cwt. He said that, immediately on his learning that Mr. Butterworth had been plundered, he went to that gentleman and told him to whom he had disposed of it, and also gave such information as led to the recovery of a large portion of property which had never passed his hands.—Lill denied that he was seen in Bell-yard on the morning in question, although he had been sworn to by a person who conversed with him, and had known him for many years. — Wakeman called nearly twenty respectable tradesmen, some of whom had known him for twenty years, and they all gave him an excellent character; Several persons also spoke in favour of Lill.—The Jury consulted for several minutes, and returned a verdict of *Not Guilty*, as to Elizabeth Wakeman, and found the other two prisoners *Guilty*.—Wakeman was sentenced to seven years' transportation, and Lill to two years' imprisonment and hard labour in the House of Correction.

EXTENSIVE SMUGGLING.—Mr. Daune, inspecting surveyor of Customs, while on board a Cus-



tom-house cutter off Gravesend, observed a pleasure yacht sailing up the river, which appeared desirous to avoid the cutter, and made all sail. Mr. Daune gave chase, and came up with the yacht at Blackwall, after a run of upwards of twenty miles. On boarding the yacht, the crew all jumped overboard into a boat and escaped, with the exception of one man, a Gravesend pilot, who said he was engaged merely to pilot the yacht up the river. Mr. Daune, satisfied that he had made a prize, brought the yacht up to the Custom-house, where he commenced a search, and, under the flooring over the ballast, discovered sixty-six tin cases, made to fit the shape of the vessel, all filled with silks of different descriptions, ribands and gauze, said to be of the value of upwards of 2,000*l*.

AN ESCAPE FROM KNIGHTHOOD.—The deputation of the Corporation of Liverpool, headed by William Ewart, esq. M.P., having attended the king's levee, to present the Liverpool address, Mr. Ewart knelt to present the address, and the king, seizing the royal sword, was about to confer the honour of knighthood on him, under the impression that he was the mayor of Liverpool. Mr. Ewart, fearing that his majesty was about to inflict knighthood on him, exclaimed hastily, "Not me; don't knight me;" on which the king asked, "Why, which is the mayor of Liverpool?" and was informed that his worship was behind. The scene excited considerable amusement in the royal circle. The mayor and the bailiffs were then introduced by lord Melbourne, and the king was pleased to confer on his worship the honour of knighthood.

JEWELS OF THE PRINCESS OF ORANGE.—Two natives of France, a man and a woman, having arrived at Liverpool in the *Monongahela*, from America, the superintendant of police apprehended them at the Prince's Dock, and succeeded in recovering property which they had brought with them, to the amount of 20,000*l*., being part of the jewels stolen from the palace at Brussels about two years ago. At the time the robbery was committed the thieves made their escape by way of Havre to America, and no trace of the property was discovered until July last, when the collector at New York seized upwards of 21,000*l*. worth, in the possession of a man who was stated to be an Italian, of the name of Carrara. He succeeded, however, in eluding the search of the police. The original value of the jewels stolen was about 212,030*l*.—*Liverpool Courier*.

EFFECTIVE MILITARY FORCE OF FRANCE IN 1831.—The following is the official return made by the Minister of War (Marshal Soult) to the Chamber of Deputies, of the effective force of the French army, up to the 1st of September, upon which the Military Estimates in the Budget for the present year are founded:—*General Officers*. Marshals of France, 12; Generals, 400; Lieut.-Generals, 141; Major-Generals, 242: total, 795.—*Staff Officers (Etat Major)*. Colonels, 33; Lieut.-Colonels, 33; Majors, 109; Captains, 326: total, 501.—*Artillery*. Lieut.-Generals, 13; Major-Generals, 20; Colonels, 48; Lieut.-Colonels, 54; Majors, 147; 1st Captains, 319; 2nd ditto, 258; 1st Lieutenants, 154; 2nd ditto, 252: total, 1265.—*Train d'Artillerie*. Majors (Chefs d'Escadron),



8 ; Captains, 33 ; Lieutenants, 45 ; Sub ditto, 43 : total, 129.—*Train des Equipages*. Colonel, 1 ; Lieut.-Colonel, 1 ; Majors (Chefs d'Escadron), 6 ; 1st Captains, 13 ; 2nd Captains, 16 ; 1st Lieutenants, 24 ; 2nd ditto, 23 ; Sub ditto, 48 : total, 132.—*Engineers*. Lieut.-Generals, 5 ; Major-Generals, 10 ; Lieutenant-Colonels, 27 ; Majors (Chefs de Bataillon), 82 ; Captains, 261 ; Brevet Captains (Lieutenants), 16 ; Lieutenants, 79 ; Sub Lieutenants, 76 : total, 556.

### *Cavalry.*

	Reserve.	Line.	Light.
Colonels .. ..	13 ..	18 ..	20
Lieut.-Colonels ..	12 ..	17 ..	20
Majors (Chefs d'Escadron) ..	38 ..	59 ..	64
Captains .. ..	197 ..	286 ..	319
	—	—	—
	260	380	423

*Departmental Gendarmerie*. Cols., 14 ; Lieutenant-Colonels, 13 ; Majors, 40 ; Captains, 120 ; Lieutenants, 314 ; Sub ditto, 187 : total, 688.—*Infantry*. Colonels, 88 ; Lieutenant-Colonels, 88 ; Majors (Chefs de Bataillon), 420 ; Captains, 2,924 : total, 3,520. — *Intendans Militaires*. Chief Intendans, 23 ; First Class Sous ditto, 25 ; Second Class Sous ditto, 48 ; Third Class Sous ditto, 97 ; Adjoints à l'Intendance, 22 : total, 225.—*Medical Department*. Inspecting Physician, 1 ; Ordinary ditto (Brevet), 41 ; Aid ditto (Brevet), 6 ; Head ditto, 10 ; Ordinary ditto (Com.), 9 ; Aid ditto (Com.), 2 : total, 69.—*Surgeons*. Inspecting Surgeon, 1 ; Surgeons Major (Brevet), 188 ; ditto Aides Major (Brevet), 265 ; ditto Sous Aides Majors (Brevet), 195 ; Head Surgeons (Brevet), 12 ; Surgeons Major (Com.), 52 ; Aides ditto (Com.), 201 ; Sous ditto (Com.), 134 : total, 1,048.—

Inspectors of Hospitals, 246 ; Apothecaries, 246 : total, 492.

### REGIMENTS.

*Artillery*. 11 Regiments of 16 Batteries each ; 1 Battalion of Pontoniers 12 Companies strong ; 12 Companies Ouvriers d'Artillerie ; 13 Companies Cannoniers Sedentaires. — *Train des Parcs d'Artillerie*. 6 Squadrons of 6 Troops each.—*Engineers*. 3 Regiments.—*Train des Equipages*. 19 Troops.—*Compagnies de Discipline*. Companies Fusileers, 4 ; Companies Pioneers, 4 : total, 8. — *Cavalry*. Regiments of Carabineers, 2 ; Regiments of Cuirassiers, 10 ; Regiments of Dragoons, 12 ; Regiments of Lancers, 6 ; Regiments of Chasseurs à Cheval, 14 ; Regiments of Hussars, 6 : total, 50.—*Infantry*. Regiments of the Line of four Battalions each, 67 ; Regiments of Light Infantry of three Battalions each, 21 : total, 88.

### OCTOBER.

RUINS OF AN EXTENSIVE CITY DISCOVERED IN CENTRAL AMERICA. — Lieut.-Colonel Galindo, governor of Poten, in central America, has discovered the ruins of an extensive city, called Palenque, which extends for more than twenty miles along the summit of the ridge which separates the country of the wild Maya Indians (included in the district of Poten) from the state of Chiapas. The principal buildings are erected on the most prominent heights, and to several of them, if not to all, there existed remains of stairs. From the hollows beneath, the steps, as well as all the vestiges which time has left, are wholly of stone and plaster. The stones, of



which the edifices are built, are about eighteen inches long, nine broad, and two thick, cemented by mortar, and gradually inclining when they form a roof, but always placed horizontally; the outside eaves are supported by large stones, which project about two feet. The wood work has all disappeared, the windows are merely small circular and square perforations. Human figures in *alto relievo* are frequent on small pillars; and fillagree work imitating boughs and feathers, is perceptible in several places. Some of the sculptured ornaments look very like the Corinthian foliage of the ancient architects. The ruins are buried in a thick forest; and the adjacent country, for leagues, contains remains of the ancient labours of the people—bridges, reservoirs, monumental inscriptions, &c.

2. RIOT IN RHODE ISLAND.—A very serious riot occurred at Providence (Rhode Island), occasioned by the supposed murder of a white seaman, whose body was found lying in front of a brothel kept by negroes. A number of the white people assembled to pull down the house, when the governor and high sheriff arrived, and required them to disperse. They refused; the bells were sounded, the drums beat, and the citizen militia turned out to assist the authorities. The white people refused to give any assistance, and crowds proceeded to pull down various wooden houses occupied by the blacks, several of which they quickly demolished. The governor and sheriff threatened to read the Riot Act, but were pelted with stones. Orders were then given to fire blank cartridges, but without effect. The governor was at length compelled to order the militia to

fire with ball, when seven were killed, and upwards of twenty wounded, several of whom died. This dispersed the rioters, and restored tranquillity.

7. RIDGWAY.—At a petty session held this day, the right hon. sir E. Thornton, K.G.B., late minister at Lisbon, appeared to answer the complaint of his son, for unlawfully and cruelly beating and assaulting him. Lady Thornton was likewise summoned to answer the same charge, but, being prevented from attending by indisposition, it was arranged that the case should proceed as if she were present. The complainant, a lad about fifteen, stated, that, on the 30th of September last, having been ordered by his mother (lady Thornton) to sweep the carpet, and clean the grate of her dressing-room, he proceeded to do so, when, about three quarters of an hour afterwards, her ladyship came into the room, and, finding the work not done, took him by the ears with both her hands, and shook him, and pushed his head against the window shutter, which made his ears bleed and his face swell. She then left the room, and locked him in. About ten minutes after, his father came, and said, "So you do not choose to finish the room," whereupon he took him by the hair with his left hand, and struck him five or six times with his right, thereby causing his face to swell. The complainant further stated the menial offices he was compelled to fulfil, which, although he considered them degrading, he never refused to execute.—Richard Callaway, servant to J. Harris, esq., deposed to the appearance of the lad when he first went to his master's house to complain.—The Counsel for Sir



E. Thornton contended that this was an inquisitorial interference on the part of the magistrates, who had no right to question the authority of a father as to the correction of his son; and that the charge of assault could not be substantiated against his clients, than whom more fond and tender parents did not exist.—Sir George Magrath, M.D., and Mr. Seacombe, surgeon, were called to prove the affection, kindness, and sympathy, displayed by sir Edward and lady Thornton towards their children upon all occasions when professional attendance had given them opportunities of witnessing their maternal and paternal conduct.—It further came out in the evidence, that sir Edward and lady Thornton had forcibly held their daughter's feet in hot water, regardless of her screams, and that they invariably employed the complainant and his brother in the culinary and household departments.—The magistrates, after having retired for a few minutes, declared it their unanimous opinion, “that Lady Thornton be convicted in the penalty of 5*l.*, and sir E. Thornton in the mitigated penalty of 1*l.*, including costs.”

9. ASSASSINATION OF COUNT CAPO D'ISTRIAS.—For some time the Count's friends had warned him that he would be assassinated: his servants continually told him that it was reported at Napoli that he would be killed. Notwithstanding this, he would not take any precautions, and continued his usual mode of life. Several times he said to the persons who visited him, “I am continually told that my life is in danger, but I am not intimidated; I shall continue to do my duty, and shall obey the voice of my conscience; fear cannot in-

fluence my determinations, and I must oppose those who want to throw the country into confusion. My life is in the hands of God, and I do not fear death—it is often a deliverance.” On the 7th and 8th of October, the President went out alone; he was again warned that it was intended to assassinate him; disregarding the admonition, he again answered, “My life is in the hands of God, I must answer it with my person, and I know that the people are attached to me.” On the 9th, at seven o'clock in the morning, he went to church, and, at the door, was attacked by the two Mavromichali, who fired their pistols point blank at the back of his head, and gave him a sabre wound in his belly; the bystanders fell on Constantine Mavromichali, and massacred him. The body of the assassin was dragged through the streets by a cord fastened to the feet, and cast into the common sewer. The other, the son of Pietro Bey, escaped to the house of the French resident. The people in a fury demanded that he should be given up, but M. Rouen would not deliver him up, except to the authorities. The Senate assembled immediately, and demanded the assassin, who was delivered up and thrown into prison. A provisional government was immediately appointed, consisting of Coletti, an advocate, Colocotroni, and Augustin Capo d'Istrias, who was absent from Napoli at the time of his brother's assassination.

PROFESSOR LEE.—The following account of Dr. Lee, who was recently presented by Lord Brougham to a prebendal stall in Bristol cathedral, affords a striking example of what industry and perseverance are capable of effecting under the most discouraging



circumstances. Lee received the rudiments of learning at a charity school at Longnor, a village about eight miles from Shrewsbury, where he was born. There he remained till he attained his twelfth year, when he was apprenticed to a carpenter and joiner: his father being dead, and his mother having two children to support by her labour. At seventeen, meeting, in the course of his reading, with Latin quotations, which he could not understand, he determined to make himself master of that language. "I had, at this time," he says, "but 6s. per week to subsist on, and to pay the expenses of board and clothing. My wages were, however, soon after, raised one shilling a week, and the next year a shilling more, during which time I read the Latin Bible, Florus, Cicero's Orations, Cæsar, Justin, Sallust, Virgil, Horace's Odes, and Ovid's Epistles. I never had all these books at once, but generally read one, and sold it, the price of which, with a little added to it, enabled me to buy another, and this, being read, was sold to procure the next." He then learned Greek and Hebrew, and, notwithstanding a frequent inflammation in his eyes, with every possible discouragement from those about him, he afterwards proceeded to acquire the Chaldaic, the Syrian, and the Samaritan. By this time he had arrived at his twenty-fifth year; he had now a good chest of tools, and, finding the study of languages, in his situation, apparently useless, he resolved to sell his books, marry, and apply himself quietly to his business. "I was awakened, however," he continues, "from these views and suggestions, by a circumstance which gave a new and distressing aspect to my affairs.

A fire broke out in the house we were repairing, in which my tools were consumed, and I was cast on the world without a friend, a shilling, or even the means of subsistence." At this tide in his affairs, he applied to the rev. Archdeacon Corbet, who kindly assisted him in his plans, and Lee shortly afterwards became master of a small charity foundation in Shrewsbury, whence he has gradually risen to the respectable station which he now enjoys. Dr. Lee holds two professorships in the university of Cambridge—those of Arabic and Hebrew.

8. RIOTS IN CONSEQUENCE OF THE REJECTION OF THE REFORM BILL.—The rejection of the Reform Bill caused some partial disturbances in the country. At Derby, a mob, on Saturday and Sunday the 8th and 9th, committed several outrages, attacked the city gaol, set the prisoners at liberty, and then proceeded to the county gaol, where they were resisted and foiled in the attempt: on Monday evening quiet was restored, but not before several lives were lost, and many persons wounded. One young man, son of Mr. Haden, surgeon, was killed by the mob.

At Nottingham, the castle, which belongs to the duke of Newcastle, was burnt down; Colwick-hall, the seat of John Musters, esq., was broken into, the furniture destroyed (including several valuable pictures, particularly sir Joshua Reynolds's whole-length of Mrs. M.), and the house set on fire, which, however, was soon extinguished. A factory at Beeston, belonging to Mr. Lowe, was burnt down. The House of Correction was attacked, but, the 15th Hussars arriving, the mob dispersed; fifteen of them



were made prisoners. Some trifling disturbances took place at Loughborough.

In the metropolis, also, fears were entertained. On the 10th, the inhabitants of Bond-street were thrown into a panic, by a report that a mob of several thousand persons were coming with the determination of breaking all windows where the shutters were not closed. Although it was only six o'clock, every shop was instantly closed, and the street presented, from one end to the other, a very dark and gloomy appearance. In Regent-street, and some other of the great thoroughfares, the shutters were closed; and where there was property, more particularly valuable, boards were nailed across. Several reform meetings were held on the same day, and various stratagems were had recourse to by their promoters to induce the shopkeepers, and other inhabitants, to make a display of revolutionary emblems.

On the 11th, as three policemen were coming through St. James's-square, with a prisoner in their custody, the crowd surrounded them, and rescued the prisoner. The constables took out their staves, but were pushed along until they arrived at Waterloo-place, where they were joined by a party of the police. At the corner of Waterloo-place, the crowd took advantage of a heap of macadamised stones, which they flung at the police in every direction, so that the latter were glad to make their escape.

Between two and three o'clock, a large assemblage took place in Hyde Park. Stones were thrown at Apsley-house, and a few squares of glass were broken, when some of the duke of Wellington's servants presented themselves at the windows. Great hissing and hooting

followed, and, immediately afterwards, a shower of stones was thrown at the house, and almost every square of glass in it was demolished. Some policemen, who were upon the spot at the time, endeavoured to drive the crowd out of the Park, but violent resistance was made, and the constables were ultimately compelled to make a precipitate retreat, and take shelter in his grace's mansion. Notice of these proceedings having been given at the St. James's police station, a large party of the C and T divisions, headed by a superintendent and four inspectors, proceeded with all possible haste to Hyde-park, where they formed in a body under the statue. They had not been there many minutes, before they were saluted with several showers of stones; these attacks were for a time borne with exemplary patience, but, at length, a large crowd having collected in front of the duke of Wellington's house, the police, in number about 200, sallied forth, and, in an instant, the rabble ran in all directions. Several of the ring-leaders were taken into custody, and conveyed to Knightsbridge-barracks.

After the mob had been driven out of Hyde-park, they proceeded to the mansion of earl Dudley, and commenced throwing stones at the windows; but a strong body of police, who had been stationed in his lordship's stables, suddenly rushed upon them with their staves, and the mob were beaten off.

Some desperate attacks were made upon the new police by regularly organized gangs of pick-pockets, and several constables were very severely beaten. At the corner of Charles-street, St. James's-square, some young thieves were taken into custody by three



of the police, who were detached from the main body; the prisoners were rescued, and the constables were obliged to make their escape. One of the inspectors of the C division, who was parading in Pall Mall in private clothes, was recognised by some of the rabble, who kicked and beat him in so brutal a manner, that he narrowly escaped with his life. After the levee was over, a vast number of the lower orders assembled in the Park, awaiting the arrival of some of the anti-reform peers. About five o'clock, the marquis of Londonderry, accompanied by a friend, made his appearance on horseback, and was proceeding to the House of Lords. Before the marquis was aware, he found himself in the midst of between 4,000 and 5,000 persons. At first he was not recognised, and he was proceeding with apparent security, when, on a sudden, a voice exclaimed, "There goes the marquis of Londonderry." In an instant he was assailed with pebbles. Several of the missiles struck his lordship, which so enraged him, that he pulled up his horse, and solemnly declared that he would shoot at the first individual who again dared to molest him. His lordship accompanied his declaration by pulling out a brace of pistols. This, for a time, so intimidated the mob, that they gave way in a slight degree; and, after the marquis had conversed for a few seconds with a gentleman on horseback near him, he rode off towards the Horse Guards. Thither the mob followed; and, believing that his lordship only endeavoured to intimidate them, they commenced another attack. The showers of stones were now thicker than ever, and one stone, hurled with considerable force, struck the noble mar-

quis immediately over his right temple, cut through his hat, and inflicted a serious wound on his head, which rendered his lordship nearly insensible. The military here interposed, and the marquis was placed in a hackney-coach and conveyed home.

12. This evening a hurricane passed over a considerable portion of the park of Thorndon Hall, the seat of lord Petre, near Brentwood, in Essex. It traversed the park in a varying sweep of about 150 yards breadth. In a circle of nearly forty yards diameter, whole trunks, huge limbs and branches, with immense masses of earth, lay on the ground in wild confusion, mingled in such a manner, that it was impossible to count the number of trees destroyed. Lofty oaks were struck near their summits, and immense portions of their upper limbs and branches torn down. In a magnificent plantation of firs, several were struck down or torn up; some of them being from seventy to eighty feet in length.

16. ATTACK UPON LORD TANKERVILLE.—As lord Tankerville, who had voted against the Reform Bill, was proceeding to Northumberland, his carriage was attacked at Darlington by a mob of some hundred persons. He had stopped for half an hour at the inn, during which time the mob had ascertained to whom the carriage belonged. A crowd soon assembled under the windows with hooting and hisses; and when he had proceeded some way down the street, he was assailed by a volley of paving stones and other missiles, from a double line of men who were ranged along the street, with heaps prepared before them. By good fortune the party escaped without



any severe injury, though for two or three minutes they were in imminent danger of their lives. Several paving stones entered the carriage, between three and four pounds in weight, besides two glass bottles, and other missiles still more dangerous. The blinds, lamps, and window frames were destroyed, and the pannels stove in in every direction. Lady Fitzharris and her maid were in the carriage, which they were seen to enter, and a stone was actually thrown at the maid before they set off.

17. RIOT AT BLANDFORD.—Lord Ashley having triumphed over the Reform candidate in the election for Dorsetshire, Blandford town was in a state of turbulence the whole of the day; and the houses of his lordship's attorneys, that of the vicar, and others of the Tory party, were marked out as objects of violence. A troop of the 3rd Dragoons arrived in the evening. About seven o'clock the mob, armed with bludgeons and stones, attacked the house of an attorney of the name of Moore (who acted for lord Ashley), demolished the windows, pulled down part of the wall before the house, and destroyed the greenhouse. They then proceeded to a Mr. Smith's, another of lord Ashley's lawyers, and also smashed the windows, panes, frames, and shutters in the front. They next broke down the gates, then went to the back of the house, and destroyed the windows there. After this they visited the parsonage. In less than five minutes the pannels of the doors, the windows, and shutters, were beaten in, and the house laid entirely open. The mob would doubtless have razed it to the ground, but for the timely

arrival of the military. The soldiers, after a short time, retired, and the mob returned to Mr. Moore's, broke open the counting-house, took out deeds, wills, law books, &c., and threw them in fragments into the streets. They also went again to Smith's and destroyed his books, papers, and parchments. At half past ten, Mr. Portman, one of the county members, addressed them, beseeching them to desist from acts of violence, and to return home: their numbers were much diminished at eleven, at which time they broke Dr. Heywood's windows, and destroyed part of his premises. They then marched away to a Mr. Cross's, a clergyman, who resided near the town, with an intention of continuing their work of mischief; but, a shot being fired, they returned without doing much injury—one of them carrying the gun, which they had captured. At half-past twelve the town was tolerably quiet.

ANNUAL THEATRICALS.—M. Martin, from the Cirque Olympique of Paris, and his wild beasts, were introduced last night at Drury-lane theatre. In one scene he is seen lying asleep on a lioness, and is afterwards defended by that animal, and a very fine male lion, against a party of armed soldiers. Two boa constrictors wind themselves round his children, whom he rescues from the frightful folds of the serpents. There is a procession in which two elephants figure; a llama is hunted by Indians, and some Indians are hunted by a small tiger. In the latter part of the drama, M. Martin is thrown into the den of a lioness, reputed to be the fiercest of her kind, and after a long and arduous fight, destroys the animal. The last scene exhibits the tri-



umphal entry of Hyder Ali into Mysore, with his elephants. The docility of the beasts was very remarkable, and the general effect of the exhibition extremely surprising and curious.

18. DISMISSAL OF EARL HOWE,—Mr. Trevor, on the 14th, put a question in the House of Commons to the paymaster of the Forces, respecting the dismissal of earl Howe from the office of Chamberlain to her majesty. The answer he received was, that the noble earl had tendered his resignation, and that it was accepted. Mr. Trevor now read the following letter from his lordship.

“ *Gopsal Atherstone, Oct. 16.*

“ Sir,—Although I have not the honour of your acquaintance, I am certain you will pardon the liberty I take in making a few observations on a question which the papers of yesterday mentioned to have been put by you in the House of Commons respecting my dismissal from the Queen’s household. If the answer lord John Russell is reported to have given, in the *Times*, is the one he really made, I must say his lordship made a statement at direct variance with the real facts of the case, which are these:—In the month of May last, and for the second time, I submitted to his majesty my intention of opposing the Reform Bill, and my perfect readiness to resign my situation as Chamberlain to the Queen, at any moment that he might be pleased to fix on. I received in reply a most gracious command to retain my office, and a distinct recognition of my privilege of being perfectly independent of any government from the circumstance of my being in her majesty’s household. My having

offered to resign again was out of the question, as I was allowed, by the king’s own communication, to act and vote exactly as I pleased. Nothing, therefore, but the positive request of lord Grey and his colleagues to the king for my removal, in consequence of my vote the other night has been the cause of my being no longer in her majesty’s household. I feel that it is but common justice to my own character to make this statement, and to give you full authority to make whatever use of it you like, except the insertion of it in the public papers.—I have the honour to be your faithful and obedient servant,

“ HOWE.”

“ *The Hon. A. Trevor.*”

Mr. Trevor, therefore, wished to ask whether the noble earl who had lately filled the office of Chamberlain to her majesty was dismissed in consequence of the vote he had given on the Reform Bill, notwithstanding the previous understanding that he should be at liberty to vote as he pleased upon that question.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer said, that nothing could be clearer than the prerogative of the crown to retain or dismiss its own servants. It would be contrary to his duty, as a minister of the crown, to state any reason why this prerogative had been acted upon in the instance to which the hon. member adverted.

19. THE DUKE OF NEWCASTLE’S TENANTRY.—A deputation waited upon the duke of Newcastle on Wednesday, with the following address, containing signatures of 313 of his grace’s tenantry resident upon his estates in the vicinity of Clumber:—



*To His Grace the Duke of Newcastle, Lord Lieutenant of the county of Nottingham, K.G., &c. &c.*

We, the undersigned inhabitants of the parishes of Bevercotes, Bothamsall, Cromwell, West Drayton, Egmanton, Elksley, Houghton, Holme, East and West Markham, Milton, Muskham, Tuxford, and Walesby, deeply regretting the attempts that have been made to destroy your grace's property, cannot find terms sufficiently strong to express our detestation of proceedings so revolting to every good feeling. Living, as we do, in the neighbourhood of your grace's residence, where your character and virtues are felt and appreciated, and sensible as we are of the comforts and advantages derived from so kind and liberal a landlord, we feel a real pleasure in coming forward to declare our respect for, and attachment to, your grace; and to offer our united services to protect your person, and that of every individual member of your family; and at the same time to assure your grace, that it is our unanimous determination to exert every energy in our power to prevent the destruction and plunder of your grace's property, and a repetition of outrages so flagrant and disgraceful to the county.

**CHOLERA.**—The Board of Health have issued the following statement: "The following are the early symptoms of the disease in its most marked form, as it occurred to the observation of Dr. Russell, and Dr. Barry, at St. Petersburg, corroborated by the accounts from other places where the disease has prevailed:—Giddiness, sick stomach, nervous agitation, intermittent, slow, or small pulse, cramps

beginning at the tops of the fingers and toes, and rapidly approaching the trunk, give the first warning. Vomiting or purging, or both these evacuations of a liquid like rice-water or whey, or barley-water, come on; the features become sharp and contracted, the eye sinks, the look is expressive of terror and wildness; the lips, face, neck, hands, and feet, and soon after the thighs, arms, and whole surface assume a leaden, blue, purple, black, or deep brown tint, according to the complexion of the individual, varying in shade with the intensity of the attack. The fingers and toes are reduced in size, the skin, and soft parts covering them are wrinkled, shrivelled, and folded; the nails put on a blueish pearly white, the larger superficial veins are marked by flat lines of deeper black; the pulse becomes either small as a thread, and scarcely vibrating, or else totally extinct. The skin is deadly cold and often damp, the tongue always moist, often white and loaded, but flabby and chilled like a piece of dead flesh. The voice is nearly gone: the respiration quick, irregular, and imperfectly performed. The patient speaks in a whisper. He struggles for breath, and often lays his hand on his heart to point out the seat of his distress. Sometimes there are rigid spasms of the legs, thighs, and loins. The secretion of urine is totally suspended; vomitings and purgings, which are far from being the most important or dangerous symptoms, and which, in a very great number of cases of the disease, have not been profuse, or have been arrested by medicine early in the attack, succeed. It is evident that the most urgent



and peculiar symptom of this disease is the sudden depression of the vital powers: proved by the diminished action of the heart, the coldness of the surface and extremities, and the stagnant state of the whole circulation. It is important to advert to this fact, as pointing out the instant measures which may safely and beneficially be employed where medical aid cannot immediately be procured. All means tending to restore the circulation and maintain the warmth of the body should be had recourse to without delay. The patient should always immediately be put to bed, wrapped up in hot blankets, and warmth should be sustained by other external applications, such as repeated frictions with flannels and camphorated spirits; poultices of mustard and linseed (equal parts) to the stomach, particularly where pain and vomiting exist; similar poultices to the feet and legs, to restore their warmth. The returning heat of the body may be promoted by bags containing hot salt or bran applied to different parts of it. For the same purpose of restoring and sustaining the circulation, white wine whey, with spice, hot brandy and water, or sal volatile, in the dose of a tea-spoonful in hot water, frequently repeated, or from five to twenty drops of some of the essential oils, as peppermint, cloves, or cajeput, in a wine glass of water, may be administered; with the same view, where the stomach will bear it, warm broth with spice may be employed. In very severe cases, or where medical aid is difficult to be obtained, from twenty to forty drops of laudanum may be given, in any of the warm drinks previously recommended. These

simple means are proposed as resources in the incipient stage of the disease, where medical aid has not yet been obtained. In reference to the further means to be adopted in the treatment of this disease, it is necessary to state that no specific remedy has yet been ascertained; nor has any plan of cure been sufficiently recommended by success to warrant its express recommendation from authority. The Board have already published a detailed statement of the methods of treatment adopted in India, and of the different opinions entertained as to the use of bleeding, emetics, calomel, opium &c. There is reason to believe that more information on this subject may be obtained from those parts of the continent where the disease is now prevailing; but even should it be otherwise, the greatest confidence may be reposed in the intelligence and zeal which the medical practitioners of this country will employ in establishing an appropriate method of cure.

HENRY HALFORD,

President of the Board.

21. THE BISHOP OF LONDON AND ST. ANN'S, SOHO.—The church of St. Ann, in Dean-street, Soho, having undergone repair, was re-opened on Sunday morning for divine service. It was agreed some time since to solicit the Bishop of London to preach a sermon on the occasion for the benefit of St. Ann's school, and his lordship consented to do so; but no sooner was this arrangement announced by handbills, than a rumour was spread that a great number of the congregation would leave the church immediately on the bishop ascending the pulpit. The rumour gained ground until it reached the



ear of the bishop, who wrote to Dr. M'Leod, the Rector; and the result was, the following handbill, signed by the churchwardens, was distributed, on Friday, throughout the parish:—

“*St. Ann, Westminster.*”—The parishioners are respectfully informed that the Rev. Dr. M'Leod, the Rector has received a letter from the Lord Bishop of London, stating that his lordship is unavoidably prevented from preaching in this church on the morning of Sunday next.

23. Paris has been thrown into some agitation by the refusal of the police to allow a new piece, entitled “*Le Procès d'un Marechal de France, 1815,*” to be performed at the Theatre des Nouveautés. The marshal was Ney, who was shot for treason, and the piece was of a political character. M. Manguin, a barrister, has advised the proprietor to try the case. The liberals complain that the new government is less tolerant than that of Prince Polignac, and that the press and the theatre are more crippled by restrictions than they were under Charles X.

26. RIOTS AT FRANKFORT.—The *Vendanges*, which last three days, commenced the day before yesterday. It is an old custom to leave the gates of the town during these three days open until ten o'clock at night, although at this season they are usually shut at six in the evening. The Governor, however, gave orders that they should be shut at the usual hour. The guard, acting upon this command, closed the gates before ten o'clock. This greatly irritated the people of the town who had been out to view the fire-works; and the greatest part of them on their re-

turn, refused to pay the tax of four creutzers imposed on the late-comers. A scuffle ensued, several persons were wounded, and many windows broken. This affair took place on the 24th. The governor, alarmed at this manifestation of public feeling, explained himself more clearly on the following day, and the gates were left open until ten. But the feelings of the citizens had been too grievously wounded to pass quietly over the supposed attack on their liberties; and consequently, at ten o'clock on the 25th, the affair assumed a more serious aspect. The workmen in the town attacked the troops on duty near the gate. The Citizens, or National Guard, were immediately called out. These, however, it seems, under pretext of re-establishing order, sided in reality with the mob. The consequence was, that the troops were compelled at last to fly; and the National Guard took immediate possession of their post, and for some time did duty in that quarter. On the popular side many persons were dangerously wounded; the loss of the troops was comparatively greater, and three men were killed on the spot.

29. SIR WALTER SCOTT.—PORTSMOUTH.—Sir Walter Scott and his daughter embarked this morning in the *Barham*, 52 guns, Captain H. Pigott, and sailed for the Mediterranean. As soon as it was known that he was to embark here, a deputation from the Literary and Philosophical Society, consisting of D. Howard, esq., President, the Rev. Mr. Neave, and Mr. J. W. Williams, Vice Presidents, and Mr. Julian Slight, Secretary, were deputed to wait on this distinguished per-



sonage immediately on his arrival, to express the high sense the society entertained of his great literary acquirements, and to request that he would accede to the wishes of the members, and allow his name to be added to the list of honorary members. Accordingly, on Monday last, the deputation had the honour of an interview with the "Author of Waverley," and were received with all that courtesy and urbanity of manners for which Sir Walter is so eminently conspicuous. The interview lasted upwards of an hour; and although Sir Walter was evidently labouring under severe indisposition, the deputation were highly gratified by the recital of various interesting anecdotes, in which the slumbering energies of his mind broke through the trammels which appeared to hold it in temporary subjection. The worthy baronet expressed himself highly flattered at the attention shown him by the members of the society, to whom he begged, individually and collectively, to return his grateful thanks, and assured them that he felt great pleasure in acceding to their request in allowing his name to appear on the records of their institution as one of its honorary members.

THE SEASON. — Such is the mildness of the weather at this season, that wild roses were plucked in the neighbourhood of Dulwich and Sydenham during the last week. Geraniums and balsams, and that magnificent flower, the dahlia, which yearly improves under our mode of culture, are now blowing in the open ground in all the luxuriance of a latter summer. To these may be added the many varieties of the Penstemons, the camelina tuberosa, the

Tigridia pavonia (called also Ferraria), together with all our tender annuals of the climbing sort, with several others of different kinds, too numerous to remark upon. Such instances are rare in our climate at this time of the year, and are some compensation for the heavy visitations of frost that took place in the month of May last.

COVENT GARDEN THEATRE.—The following is a statement of the receipts of this theatre during the following seasons:—

SEASONS.	£.	s.	d.
1809-10 .....	96,051	14	4
1810-11 .....	106,177	8	10
1811-12 .....	95,001	6	2
1812-13 .....	78,209	3	8
1813-14 .....	87,160	14	11
1814-15 .....	93,613	17	9
1815-16 .....	83,780	7	9
1816-17 .....	77,603	1	3
1817-18 ... ..	75,149	9	8
1818-19 .....	74,121	12	4
1819-20 .....	55,833	14	0
1820-21 .....	69,108	15	10

---

£991,811 6 6

Average, per season, 82,650*l.*  
18*s.* 10½*d.*

LIVERPOOL AND MANCHESTER RAILWAY.—Receipts from January 1st 1831, to June 30th.—The coach department for the conveyance of passengers, 43,600*l.* 7*s.* 5*d.* Carriage of merchandise, 21,875*l.* —Ditto of coal, 218*l.* 16*s.* 2*d.*—Gross Receipts, 65,693*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.*—Expenses attending the concern during the same period for repairs of locomotive engines, carriages, road, police, taxes, salaries, interest of debt, &c. 35,379*l.*—Net receipts, 30,314*l.* 13*s.* 7*d.* which, divided amongst 7,012 shares, allows a dividend of 4*l.* 10*s.* per share for the half-year,



## 31. LONDON POLITICAL UNION.

—In consequence of advertisements issued for holding a meeting at the Crown and Anchor Tavern, for the purpose of forming a Political Union of the middling and working classes, under the auspices of Sir Francis Burdett, Colonel Jones, Mr. Wakley, and other persons of similar political opinions, a vast crowd of people assembled. Before one o'clock the great room was crowded to excess, though none of the leaders had yet made their appearance. One individual excited great uproar, by stating that he understood from a committee man, that the Union was not to pledge itself to universal suffrage, and that therefore none of his friends, who he was sure composed five-sixths of the meeting, had any business there. Another individual recommended that they should first wait to hear the resolutions, and if they then found that "Universal Suffrage and Universal Ballot," were not included, they should know how to act. Upon something like order being restored, the meeting was adjourned to Lincoln's Inn-fields. There certain resolutions were read, which stated the objects of the Union, and its rules and regulations, to be as follows:—

*"Objects of the National Political Union.*—1. To support the King and his ministers against a small faction in accomplishing their great measure of parliamentary Reform.—2. To unite all well-wishers to their country, from the richest to the poorest, in the pursuit of such an important object.—3. To afford a channel for the collecting public opinion, in order that all its moral weight may be brought to bear upon the Legislature.—4. To preserve peace and

order in the country, and to guard against any convulsion which the enemies of the people may endeavour to bring about.—5. To watch over and promote the interests and to better the condition of the industrious and working classes.—6. To give opportunities, by frequent public discussions, for eliciting the best means by which the above objects may be carried into execution."

*"Rules and Regulations of the National Political Union.*—1. All persons whatsoever are admitted as members of this association who shall cause their names to be entered in books appointed for the purpose, and shall conform to the following rules and regulations.—2. All persons becoming members of this Union, shall subscribe — shillings quarterly: and are requested to make such further donations or annual quarterly subscriptions as they can conveniently afford. — 3. All members shall strictly observe the just and legal directions of the officers of the association to whom the management of its affairs shall be committed.—4. The general management of the Union is committed to a council of — individuals, to be chosen annually at a general meeting, and subject only to the control of such annual or other general meeting.—5. The general meetings choose annually three auditors for the ensuing year, to pass the accounts of the council; and if two of the auditors cannot agree in passing the accounts, the subject of difference is to be referred to a general meeting.—6. The general meetings choose a treasurer and trustees, in whose hands the funds of the association are deposited. — 7. An annual general meeting of the members of



the Union is held on the first day of

—8. General meetings may at any time be called together by an order signed by the chairman and deputy chairman, countersigned by the secretary, or by an order signed by six of the members of council, or by a requisition signed by 200 members of the Union. The order or requisition for such meeting to be advertised in three London newspapers.—9. At the annual general meeting, the council, auditors, treasurer, and trustees are chosen. Each individual who shall be proposed for office is put in nomination separately (or in such way as the general meeting may direct), and is elected by a majority of the members present, the chairman deciding on which side is the majority, unless a division be demanded, when tellers shall be appointed in the usual way.—10. At the general meetings the secretary will produce the books for inspection, and in the whole conduct of the union every species of concealment or mystery is to be carefully avoided. — 11. The council (of whom form a quorum) meets weekly, or as often as they may deem necessary, keeping a record of their proceedings at each meeting.—12. The council appoints a chairman, deputy chairman, secretary, collectors of contributions, and such other officers, either with or without salaries, as may be found expedient.—13. The council appoints a solicitor and legal adviser to the Union, if occasion require.—14. The council shall watch closely the proceedings of the legislature, shall call general meetings when necessary, present addresses and petitions to the crown and the legislature when the interests of the people are at stake,

and generally shall use every exertion in furthering the objects of the Union.—15. The council employs the funds of the association solely in promoting its objects, according to their best judgment and discretion.—16. No part of the funds of the association shall be expended in any object wherein a member of the council is personally interested, except by votes of two-thirds of a council, specially called for the purpose of considering the question.—17. The treasurer shall pay money only to orders passed by the council and countersigned by the secretary.—18. No alteration or addition to the above rules and regulations shall be made, unless it be recommended by the council, or unless, on refusal of the council to bring the motion forward, it be adopted by four-fifths of a general meeting, specially summoned for the purpose."

The other resolutions recommended that similar societies should be formed throughout the country, and that the president of any such society should become, on admission into the Metropolitan Political Union, a member of its council,—The reading of the resolutions was received with great applause.

The principal speakers were certain persons of the names of Fox, Detroissier, Savage, Lovett, Clive, together with Mr. Wakley, Col. Jones, and Mr. Hume.

---

## NOVEMBER.

RIOTS AT BRISTOL AND OTHER PLACES.—Bristol was the theatre of the most disgraceful outrages that have been perpetrated in this country since the riots of London in 1780,



Sir Charles Wetherell, the Recorder of Bristol, having announced it to be his intention to arrive in that city on Saturday the 29th Oct. last in his judicial capacity, great fears of disturbance were entertained, in consequence of his conduct on the reform question. At the time appointed, dense masses of the lower orders poured out from St. Philip's, Lawford's Gate, &c., to meet the Recorder, and several persons assembled at Totterdown. At about half-past ten, Sir Charles was perceived to approach, at a rapid rate, in a chariot drawn by four grays, and on stopping at Totterdown for the purpose of being handed into the sheriff's carriage, he was assailed by yells, groans, and hisses. The constables were then placed around the carriage, a gentleman on horseback riding close by the side of each door, and 300 or 400 preceding and following. In this manner the cavalcade proceeded slowly towards the city. Just as Sir Charles was passing over Hill's-bridge, his carriage was assailed with four or five stones; but no movement took place with a view to apprehend the offenders, the whole force being anxious only for the protection of the Recorder's person. As the procession moved onward, the crowd continued to increase, and occasionally some stone or missile was hurled against the object of their displeasure. In Temple-street, the windows of the houses were crowded with spectators, and the lower orders of females were particularly vociferous, frequently charging the men with cowardice and want of spirit. In passing from the bridge to High-street, one of the constables, received a dangerous contusion on the head; and, in the latter

street, also, some few stones were thrown.

On arriving at the Guildhall, in Broad-street, it was with the greatest difficulty that Sir Charles could alight; but in a few minutes he was handed out in safety, and proceeded to take his station on the bench. The reading of the commission was then attempted to be proceeded with, but the confusion was so great, that the voice of the Mayor's clerk could not be heard: and the Recorder addressing one of the officers, said, if the latter saw any person in court making a disturbance, and would bring him forward, he would immediately commit him; but the officer replied, that the tumult arose chiefly from a few individuals, and suggested the propriety of placing some constables in the body of the hall. Several of the special constables then dispersed themselves among the people, who commenced a different species of annoyance, by coughing, which ended in a general burst of indignation. In this manner the usual preliminaries were gone through, and the court was adjourned till eight o'clock on Monday morning. The Recorder then withdrew from the bench, and the populace gave three cheers for the King, and retired into the street.

After the Recorder alighted at the Mansion house, a rush was made on the populace by a posse of special constables, for the purpose of securing the persons by whom the missiles had been thrown, and an individual was dragged in. Again, another rush took place, and another capture was made; and this was repeated several times. At this moment the number of persons collected in the square could not have been less than



10,000; and a cry having been raised of "To the back," where piles and faggots of firewood are usually kept, a large body proceeded thither, and, having armed themselves with sticks, returned in a few minutes to the scene of action: but, the constables rushing out in a body, the sticks were soon strewed in every direction. This was about half-past 12 o'clock. From that period till about four o'clock the time was passed in occasional skirmishes between the constables and the populace, which generally ended in some one being taken into custody. At about four o'clock, a considerable portion of the constabulary force was unadvisedly permitted to retire to their homes, for the purpose of refreshing themselves. From that moment the mob became more daring, until at length the Mayor came forward, to beg of them to depart. His worship warned them of the possible consequences of continuing their refractory proceedings: and, in alluding to the military, known to be in the immediate neighbourhood, said, that he should be sorry if, during his mayoralty, such scenes took place as most probably would ensue, if he should be compelled to read the Riot Act, and call in the troops. The Riot Act was then read, but the mob, perceiving the weakness of the force opposed to them, rushed upon the constables, disarmed them, and beat them severely. Nothing now remaining to curb the mob, the work of violence commenced by a general and simultaneous attack on every part of the Mansion-house. In an instant, the windows and sashes were smashed—the shutters were beaten to pieces—the doors forced—and every article of furniture on the ground floor broken

up. The iron palisades, together with the curb-stones in which they were set, were thrown down as if they had been mere reeds stuck in a mud-bank, and furnished many a desperate villain with a formidable iron bar; young trees were torn up by the roots and converted into weapons of destruction; walls were thrown down to provide bricks, with which to assail the upper windows; and straw and combustibles were procured with which to fire the whole premises. At this critical moment Sir Charles effected his retreat through the adjoining premises; but it was not made known until twelve o'clock on the following day, Sunday, that he had left the city. For the present, however, the Mansion-house was saved from conflagration by the arrival of the troops. Under the protection of the military, the constables again collected in considerable numbers, and several of the most daring of the mob were made prisoners. Still it was found impossible to clear the square or the streets adjacent. The soldiers trotted their horses backward and forward amidst the cheers of the mob, but not the slightest disposition was shewn to disperse. The Colonel of the district, Colonel Brereton, cautioned them of the consequences which their conduct would infallibly draw upon them. He was every where received with the greatest cordiality, and with loud cheers. About twelve o'clock at night, a party of the rioters proceeded to the Council-house, where they commenced operations by smashing the windows. Meanwhile orders were given to the cavalry to make a charge, and the scene became one of the greatest confusion. The people who ran



in all directions, were pursued through the streets by the soldiers, and several of them received severe cuts from their sabres. Many took refuge in the various passages in Wine-street, whence they assailed the troops with stones, particularly at the top of the Pithay, where one of the soldiers having been struck, immediately turned round, and shot a man dead upon the spot. This was at half-past twelve, and the soldiers continuing to gallop about the streets, prevented the re-assembling of the mob during the night.

On Sunday the people again began to assemble at an early hour in Queen-square, but, every thing remaining quiet, the troops were withdrawn for some refreshment, having been on duty more than twenty-four hours. They had scarcely disappeared, when the mob again commenced their outrages, and, ascending to the upper rooms of the Mansion-house, they proceeded to throw out the valuable furniture into the square. Another exciting cause now began to develope itself. During the sacking of the Mansion-house, the wine cellars were forced, and at least one third of a stock of 300 dozen of choice wines was carried off, and wasted or drunk by the mob. The result was, that they became madly infuriated, and regardless alike of what mischief they committed, or what risk they incurred. All ages, of both sexes, were to be seen greedily swallowing the intoxicating liquors, while upon the ground the bodies of scores were to be found dead with drunkenness. The troops again appeared, but the infuriate mob began to act on the offensive, and attacked them with a shower of stones and brickbats. In this

state of things the commanding officer judged it prudent to withdraw the troops (the 14th Light Dragoons) and replace them with a body of the 3rd Dragoon Guards. On the retirement of the former, they were followed by a large portion of the mob, who continued their assaults upon them along the quay and over the draw-bridge. On arriving at St. Augustine's Back, being provoked beyond further forbearance, they turned round and fired several shots on their assailants, and a further loss of life was the result. The mob, however, still continued to follow them, and in College-green some further firing occurred. Still the mob continued their assaults, until the troops arrived at their quarters in the Boar's-head-yard, where they again fired. The discharges were, however, but partial; the number of killed being one, and of wounded, seven or eight. Immediately after these occurrences colonel Brereton rode down to the square, followed by a considerable number of men and boys, who cheered him on his way thither. Assuring them that there should be no more firing, and that the 14th should be immediately sent out of the city, again exhorted them to return to their homes.

In the square, with the exception of the scenes of drunkenness which were still going on, nothing further occurred until the evening, with the exception that an individual mounted the statue of king William, and, fixing a tri-coloured cap on a long pole, pronounced aloud, "The Cap of Liberty!" The soldiers were drawn up in front of the Mansion-house, and the mob seemed nowise disposed to molest them.

After a while, however, they manifested a restlessness for action, and



a party, by no means numerous, proceeded to the Bridewell. On their arrival, having procured sledge-hammers from the nearest smith's shop, they beat in the doors, liberated the prisoners, and set the building on fire. During this operation, not the slightest molestation was offered them. This happened about two o'clock. About the same time a stronger party proceeded to the New Gaol; along the New Cut, in front of the gaol, a dense mass of the rioters assembled; and, on the opposite bank of the river, the people were posted in thousands. The mob succeeded in forcing an entrance into the yard and the governor's-house, and threw every moveable article into the New River. They next procured hammers from the adjoining ship-yard, with which the massive locks on the iron doors of the cells were smashed to atoms. The prisoners were then released; many of them, both male and female, stripped off their prison clothes, and proceeded on their way almost in a state of nudity. As they passed along, the mob cheered them and followed them with exultations. After the prisoners had been liberated, amounting, altogether, exclusive of debtors, to more than 100, the next step was to set the prison on fire; and a black handkerchief was tied to the weathercock on the top of the porter's lodge, over the gateway, as a signal for commencing operations. Immediately dense clouds of smoke issued from every part of the building. The flames were first seen to break out from the tread-mill, which burnt with fury until it was quite consumed. In about an hour the governor's-house was completely enveloped in flames; the wings,

however, being built almost exclusively of stone and iron, with iron roofs, were but little injured. During these proceedings, a party of the 3rd Guards, about twenty in number, arrived; and the mob cheered the troops, who acknowledged the compliment by taking off their caps, and, almost immediately after, wheeled round and departed. As soon as the work of destruction was completed here, the rioters divided themselves into parties, the one proceeding to the Toll-houses, at Princes-street-bridge, another to the Toll-house at the Wells, and another to the one at St. Phillips: these were speedily in flames. They then set off, about seven o'clock, to the Gloucester county prison, and having broken into it, released all the prisoners, and set fire to the building. At the same time, also, a party proceeded to Bridewell, which had been only partially destroyed, and set fire to the wing occupied by the keeper; so that the three prisons were in flames at the same instant.

A handful of the miscreants then proceeded to the Bishop's palace, Canon's-marsh, and immediately commenced the work of destruction. A few individuals succeeded for a while in staying their designs, and orders were sent that the military, at the Mansion-house, should hasten to the protection of the Bishop's residence. They had no sooner set out for that purpose, than the mob set fire to the Mansion-house. On the arrival of the troops at the Bishop's palace, matters there were in a tolerably quiet state, and having returned to Queen-square, they found the whole of the back premises of the Mansion-house burning with fury, and the apartments in the front rooms occupied by wretches facili-



tating the destruction of the building, by firing the apartments simultaneously. The infatuated creatures pressed forward to the windows and waved their handkerchiefs, in exultation of the final accomplishment of their designs. From the rapidity of the progress of the flames, it is supposed that some were cut off from a retreat, and that they thus met with an untimely end. In about twenty minutes the roof fell in, and, together with the whole front, came down into the street with a tremendous crash. In the mean time the Bishop's-palace had been set on fire, and the flames were raging throughout the whole pile of building, which in a short period was reduced to ashes. The bishop had left the city about mid-day.

After the destruction of the Mansion-house, the rioters conceived the plan of setting fire to the adjoining houses, and, by twelve at night, the whole mass, from the Mansion-house to the middle avenue, including the Custom-house and all the Back Building, in Little King-street, were one immense mass of fire. The Custom-house was a large building, and the expertness of the wretches in lighting it up, proved the destruction of many of them who were ranging the upper apartments. Some of them were seen to drop into the flames, and others in desperation threw themselves from the windows. A small band, chiefly boys, who seemed to go about their work as if they had been regularly trained to the hellish employment, proceeded to extend the conflagration; preceding their operation by giving half an hour's notice to the inmates of the houses to retire. The windows were afterwards smashed in, and the premises

were ignited with astonishing rapidity. In this manner they swept away one whole side of Queen's-square, and then proceeded to another; commencing with the Excise-office, at the corner. From this time, three o'clock in the morning, the flames extended to the houses of the parallel streets and to many of the principal wine and spirit stores. Altogether there were completely destroyed forty-two dwelling houses and warehouses, exclusive of the Mansion-house, Excise-office, Custom-house, the four toll houses, the three prisons, and the bishop's-palace. All seemed panic-struck, and but few cared except for their personal safety. The city seemed given up to plunder; young fellows, in parties of four, five, or six, repaired to liquor-shops and public-houses, knocked at the doors, and demanded drink or blood. When morning dawned, the flames were subsiding, but the appearance of Queen-square was appalling in the extreme. Numerous buildings were reduced to a heap of smoking ruins, and others were momentarily falling in: while, around, lay several of the rioters, in the last stage of senseless intoxication, and with countenances more resembling fiends than man.

Meantime the soldiers, who had been ordered out of the city, were brought back; and the magistrates, having re-assembled, came at length to a decision, and called out the *posse comitatus*. The military were then ordered to clear the streets—an order which was fulfilled to the letter by a party of the troops which had experienced some rough treatment, and had in consequence fired upon the people on the previous day. Nothing was to be seen on every side but women and children, running and



screaming in every direction, many were severely wounded and some killed. Towards the evening, the flames in several houses of the square broke out afresh, and part of the pavement in King-street was forced up by the heat arising from some brandy which was burning in the vaults beneath, but the engines being in readiness, no further injury occurred. An attack on the shipping had been anticipated, and preparations were made to repel it; but happily those fears were not realized.

The number killed and wounded did not exceed 100. Of the dead, as far as could be ascertained, 6 were burnt, 2 shot, 2 died of sword cuts, and 2 of excessive drinking;—of the wounded, 10 were injured by shots, 48 by sword cuts, 2 by drinking, and 34 from other causes. The number committed was 180, 50 of whom were capitally charged with rioting and burning.

RIOTS AT BATH, COVENTRY, AND WORCESTER.—About the same time, partial disturbances appeared in different parts of the country. At Bath, the mob made an attempt to prevent the yeomanry cavalry leaving the city, for the purpose of assisting in the suppression of the riots at Bristol. The inn where the captain of the corps stayed was almost pulled down.

On the 7th, some rioting took place at Coventry. One factory was burnt down, and the military and special constables were called out to suppress the disturbances.

At Worcester, on the 3rd of November, the mob, after breaking the windows of several houses, proceeded to the bishop's palace, and assailed the doors; but, finding there a detachment of twenty-five special constables they gave up the

attack. They also went to Prince Edgar's Tower, which is the entrance to College-green, the residence of the Prebends, but a good show of constables induced them to retreat. Constables were also placed at the gas-works and poor-houses, to prevent the town from being darkened by cutting off the gas. The Riot act was read: the mayor addressed the mob, and every exertion was made to disperse them; but about 200 itinerant thimble-and-peamen, and low thieves, excited the mob, by every means in their power; and, had it not been for the timely arrival of the military, scenes of great bloodshed must have ensued, before order could have been restored. When they arrived, and the order was given to clear the streets, the soldiers merely paraded up and down. The mob, however, soon began to pelt them. More energetic measures were then resorted to, and the soldiers attacked with the flat part of their swords all who appeared active. The mob then intrenched themselves in Bull-court, which could be approached only by descending a flight of six stone steps, and many women, as well as men, stoutly defended it with missiles. Two of the troopers were ordered to fire down the court. One of them, however, humanely preferred charging it. His horse declined the experiment of descending the steps, and a loud "hurrah" from within marked the trooper's retreat. The soldier then said to his horse, "You must do it, Bob," and, at the same moment, applied the spur. Bob answered to the summons, went down the steps with the safety of a cat or a dog, and was immediately followed by another. This so surprised the rioters, that the most ridicu-



lous scene of confusion followed—women and men scrambling and tumbling over each other; *sauve qui peut* was the only principle of action. After being routed here, the mob assembled in Foregate-street, and a proposition was made to attack the county gaol; but, on some person saying, that the governor had a considerable force of sheriff's javelin-men, militia-men, and constables, with plenty of ammunition, they altered their course of proceeding, and directed their attacks against private individuals.

PROCLAMATION. — The following proclamation was issued on November 2nd: — Whereas in divers parts of Great Britain, and more particularly in the towns of Derby and Nottingham, and in the city of Bristol, tumultuous assemblages of people have taken place, and outrages of the most violent description have been committed, both upon the persons and property of divers of our subjects; and whereas all the restraints of law and order have been overborne and trodden under foot by such lawless multitudes, the mansions of individuals violently entered, pillaged, and set on fire, the ordinary course of justice forcibly interrupted, the gaols for the confinement of criminals broken into and destroyed, and malefactors and persons charged with offences let loose upon the public, to the great disturbance and danger of the common weal, and the subversion of established government; and whereas the welfare and happiness of all nations do, under Divine Providence, chiefly depend upon the observance and enforcement of the law; and whereas it is our firm determination faithfully to discharge the duty imposed on us, to preserve the public peace, and vi-

gorously to exert the powers which we possess for the protection of all our subjects, in the entire enjoyment of their rights and liberties: — We, therefore, being resolved to suppress the wicked and flagitious practices aforesaid, have thought fit, by and with the advice of our privy council, to issue this our royal proclamation, solemnly warning all our liege subjects to guard against every attempt to violate the law, and to abstain from every act inconsistent with the peace and good order of society; and we do hereby charge and command all sheriffs, justices of the peace, chief magistrates of cities, boroughs, and corporations, and all the magistrates throughout Great Britain, that they do effectually repress all tumults, riots, outrages, and breaches of the peace within their respective jurisdictions, and that they do make diligent inquiry, in order to discover and bring to justice the movers and perpetrators of all such seditious and wicked acts as aforesaid; and we do further earnestly and solemnly exhort, enjoin, call upon, and command, all our liege subjects, of all ranks and conditions, that they do come forward upon the first appearance or apprehension of any such disturbances as aforesaid, as they are bound by their duty to us, by their regard for the general interest, and by the obligation of the law, and that they be actively aiding and assisting to all sheriffs, justices of the peace, and other magistrates, in enforcing the law against evil doers, and in protecting their fellow-subjects in the enjoyment of their property, and the exercise of their rights, against all forcible, illegal, and unconstitutional interference, control, or aggression.'



3. ATTACK ON LORD TENTERDEN.—John Hely, of Clement's-lane, Strand, by trade a journeyman tailor, was placed at the bar before Messrs. Gregorie and White, charged with attempting to break the windows of Lord Tenterden's carriage, as his lordship was proceeding to Westminster-hall.—Mr. Adamson, one of the inspectors of the A division of police, stated, that, between one and two o'clock on the previous afternoon, he was on duty near Whitehall, at the time the judges were proceeding to Westminster-hall. He saw the prisoner run up to lord Tenterden's carriage, and, after using most abusive language to his lordship, attempt to break the windows with his hat. He was immediately laid hold of and taken away, but, by some means, he made his escape. In a few minutes afterwards witness was in Palace-yard, and again saw the prisoner attempting to break the windows of his lordship's carriage, when he secured him and took him to the station-house.—Police constable Robertson, of the A division, No. 63, stated, that, on the previous afternoon, he saw the prisoner run up to the carriage, and attempt to strike the window with his hat. The witness secured him, but was instantly surrounded by a number of notorious thieves and pickpockets, and, to avoid any disturbance, he let the prisoner go, but kept his eye upon him as far as Whitehall, when he again saw him run up to his lordship's carriage.—The judgment of the bench was, that the prisoner should pay a penalty of 5*l.*, for assaulting the constable."

5. MR. OSBALDESTON'S MATCH, NEWMARKET. This match was made previous to the July meeting, between colonel Charritie and Mr. Osbaldeston, for 1,000 guineas

a-side, the latter undertaking to ride 200 miles in ten hours, in the ensuing Houghton meeting, the number of horses being unlimited. Up to last week the backers of time were numerous, the contingencies being all in their favour. In the first place Mr. Osbaldeston's age (forty-seven) was considered inimical to his doing 200 miles at a racing pace, while the mere fatigue of mounting and remounting, it was thought, would be sufficient to exhaust him; a horse might fall lame, or turn restive, be awkward to mount or pull up; the weather, too, might be unfavourable. The ground was measured over the round course, beginning and ending at the duke's stand. The saddles were covered with lamb-skin, and marked with the names of the horses to be ridden, and the order in which they were to be brought to the post; refreshments (consisting of weak brandy and water, warm, jelly, cold partridge, &c.), and changes of clothing were provided,—the latter, however, were not required, Mr. Osbaldeston preferring continuing in his wet clothes to losing time in shifting them. The umpires were Mr. Bowater for colonel Charritie, and Mr. Thelluson for Mr. Osbaldeston. The distance was divided into heats of four miles each. At twelve minutes past seven, all the arrangements being completed, Mr. Osbaldeston started. The following is a correct return of the fifty four-mile heats :

				m.	s.
1	Emma	...	...	9	0
2	Paradox	...	...	9	20
3	Liberty	...	...	9	25
4	Coroner	...	...	9	15
5	Obeston	...	...	9	40
6	Don Juan	...	...	9	0
7	Morgan Rattler	...	...	9	13



			m.	s.
8	Paradox, 2nd time	...	9	6
9	Cannon Ball	...	9	23
10	Clasher	...	9	25
11	Ultima	...	9	10
12	Fairy	...	9	5
13	Coroner, 2nd time	...	8	40
14	Liberty, ditto	...	9	21
15	Emma, ditto	...	9	21
16	Don Juan, ditto	...	9	8
17	Obeston, ditto	...	8	20
18	Cannon Ball, ditto	...	9	45
19	Ultima, ditto	...	9	0
20	Tranby	...	8	10
21	Fairy	...	8	8
22	Morgan Rattler, 2nd time	...	9	28
23	Colt by Tramp	...	8	58
24	Dolly	...	8	58
25	Acorn	...	9	2
26	A horse by Smolensko	...	8	52
27	Tranby, 2nd time	...	8	0
28	Skirmisher	...	9	25
29	Guildford	...	8	25
30	Dolly, 2nd time	...	8	45
31	Ikey Solomons	...	12	0
32	Tam o'Shanter	...	9	40
33	El Dorado	...	9	20
34	Coventry	...	9	0
35	Ringleader	...	8	42
36	Tranby, 3rd time	...	8	15
37	Ipsala	...	8	20
38	Skirmisher, 2nd time	...	8	45
39	Guildford, ditto	...	9	10
40	Streamlet	...	8	50
41	Donagani	...	9	12
42	Hassan	...	9	0
43	Surprise filly	...	9	10
44	Ringleader, 2nd time	...	9	30
45	Tranby, 4th time	...	8	50
46	Coventry, 2nd time	...	9	30
47	Ipsala, ditto	...	9	0
48	Streamlet, ditto	...	9	0
49	Donagani, ditto	...	10	15
50	Liberty, 3rd time	...	9	40

Making seven hours, nineteen minutes, and four seconds, to which must be added one hour, twenty-two minutes, and fifty-six seconds, occupied in mounting, dismounting, and refreshing, — total, eight hours and forty-two

minutes, or one hour and eighteen minutes less than the time stipulated for the performance of the match! In the tenth round Clasher broke down near home, and, in the thirty-first, Ikey Solomons having shewn symptoms of bolling, Mr. Osbaldeston threw himself off, but retained his hold of the reins, and escaped unhurt. The first twenty-four miles were done in fifty-eight minutes; the forty-eight miles in two hours, one minute, and five seconds; the sixty miles in two hours and thirty-three minutes; seventy miles in two hours and fifty-nine minutes: eighty miles in three hours, twenty-five minutes, and thirty seconds; 100 miles in four hours, nineteen minutes, and forty seconds; and 120 miles in five hours, eleven minutes, and thirty seconds. At this stage of the match Mr. Osbaldeston proceeded to the stand and lunched, stopping six minutes and twenty seconds. 136 miles were performed in six hours, and 160 in six hours and fifty-seven seconds. All the stoppages are included in these calculations; if they are deducted throughout the match, it will be seen that the whole distance was done at the rate of about twenty-six miles per hour. Tranby did his sixteen miles in thirty-three minutes and fifteen seconds. The weather was unfavourable: a drizzling rain at the commencement increased to a heavy storm, which did not cease till about ten o'clock. Just previous to commencing the 48th round a tremendous storm of wind and rain met Mr. Osbaldeston in the face, and Streamlet, frightened, actually turned round. The betting, at the making of the match, was in favour of time, but during the last meeting it changed to six or seven on Mr. Osbaldeston, increased to five to



two on the Friday night, and was four to one at the starting; 1,000 to 100 was also betted to Mr. Osbaldeston and another gentleman, that the match was not done in nine hours. The confidence of his backers was not shaken till the 31st round, when he threw himself from Ikey Solomons; it was then even betting on the match: in the 40th change it was six to four that he did it in the nine, and ten to one that he did it in the ten hours. Mr. Osbaldeston rode from the ground to the town on one of his hacks, and was loudly cheered.

The following is a list of the most remarkable feats of horsemanship on record:—In October 1741, at the Curragh meeting in Ireland, Mr. Wilde rode 127 miles in six hours and twenty-one minutes, with ten horses. The time stipulated was nine hours. In 1745, Mr. C. Thornhill rode from Stilton to London and back, and again to Stilton, being 213 miles, in eleven hours and thirty-four minutes. In 1762, Mr. Shaftoe rode fifty miles and a quarter in one hour and forty-nine minutes, with ten horses, five of which were ridden twice. In 1762, the same gentleman undertook to ride 100 miles a day for twenty-nine days together, on any one horse each day, the number of horses not to exceed twenty-nine. He accomplished it on fourteen horses, and on one day rode 160 miles, on account of the tiring of his first horse. In 1758, Miss Pond rode 1,000 miles in 1,000 hours at Newmarket. In Dec. 1810, Mr. Milton, the horse-dealer, who weighed fifteen stone, rode from London to Stamford (starting from the corner of Dover-street) in four hours and twenty-five minutes, using eighteen horses.

RAILWAY ACCIDENT. — The

train, conveying the mail and about 100 passengers on the Liverpool and Manchester railway, had got to the Newton side of Chat Moss, and was crossing the embankment at the rate of twenty miles an hour, when, in consequence of the failure of an axletree in one of the coaches, the breaking of a wheel, and the injury done to others, the whole train was forced off the rails, proceeded in a slightly diagonal direction about 600 paces, and came within a yard-and-a-half of the edge of the embankment before it could be stopped. But for the softness of the ground, in consequence of the recent rains, and the additional impediment to the progress of the train, arising from the broken wheels of one of the carriages, the whole would probably have been precipitated over the embankment, with a loss of life and limbs frightful to contemplate. No person received the slightest injury, and no material damage was sustained.

6. The following Forms of Prayer were read to-day in all Churches in the metropolis.

“ Most Gracious Father and God! who hast promised forgiveness of sins to all those that with hearty repentance and true faith turn to thee, look down, we beseech thee, from Heaven, thy dwelling-place, upon us thy unworthy servants, who, under an awful apprehension of thy judgments, and a deep conviction of our sinfulness, prostrate ourselves before thee: We acknowledge it to be of thy goodness alone that, whilst thou hast visited other nations with pestilence, thou hast so long spared us; Have pity, O



Lord! have pity on thy people, both here and abroad; withdraw thy heavy hand from those who are suffering under thy judgments, and turn away from us that grievous calamity, against which our only security is in thy compassion: We confess, with shame and contrition, that in the pride and hardness of our hearts we have shown ourselves unthankful for thy mercies, and have followed our own inclinations, instead of thy holy laws: Yet, O Merciful Father, suffer not thy destroying angel to lift up his hand against us, but keep us, as thou hast heretofore done, in health, and safety; and grant that, being warned by the sufferings of others to repent of our sins, we may be preserved from all evil by thy mighty protection, and enjoy the continuance of thy mercy and grace, through the merits of our only Mediator and Advocate, Jesus Christ. Amen."

"O, Almighty God! who, with the many instances of mortality which encompass us on every side, dost call upon us seriously to consider the shortness of our time here upon earth, and remindest us that in the midst of life we are in death, so teach us to number our days that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom. Give us grace to turn unto thee with timely repentance, and thus to obtain through the merits of our Saviour, that pardon to-day which to-morrow it

may be too late to seek for; that so, being strengthened by thy good Spirit against the terrors of death, and daily advancing in godliness, we may at all times be ready to give up our souls into thy hands, O Gracious Father, in the hope of a blessed immortality, through the mediation and for the merits of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

**RUPTURE WITH THE CHINESE AT CANTON.**—In the course of the present month, intelligence arrived of the interruption of the good understanding which had subsisted between the Canton government and the British factory. So serious was the rupture considered, that the select committee issued a public notice, that unless the evils complained of were redressed, or security given against their recurrence, all commercial intercourse between Great Britain and China would be suspended from the 1st day of August next. A circular was published explaining the motives which had dictated that resolution. The case of the Woo-Yay, managing partner of Gow-Qua's Hong, is the first topic adverted to in the circular. This innocent man fell a victim to the envy of his fellow merchants, and the malice of the governor, who gained their object by falsely alleging that he held a traitorous intercourse with the English, the proof of which consisted in his having procured for one of them a sedan chair. He was imprisoned in November 1830, was tried for his life, threatened with torture, and sentenced to banishment, to Ele, but died on the 1st of May, 1831, from the rigours of a winter's



imprisonment, and mental anxiety, operating on a feeble frame. The forcible entry of the Company's factory took place, very unexpectedly, on the 12th of May 1831, about seven o'clock in the morning. It is said, that even the Hoppo had no previous knowledge of what was intended, when the Foo-yuen called at his residence, with two or three hundred attendants, to request that he would accompany him to the factory. On entering the Public-hall, the Foo-yuen directed that the portraits with which it was decorated, should be uncovered, and when that of king George the 4th was pointed out to him, he deliberately ordered the back of his chair to be turned to it, and seated himself in a manner plainly indicating contempt. After the fire in 1822, the rubbish, removed from the ruins, was made use of by the Chinese to advance the bank of the river, immediately above the Company's factory, over a mud flat, partly dry at low water. This, of course, occasioned an increased deposit of mud in front of the factory, which so obstructed the approach of boats to the bank, that it became necessary to push out the quay about forty yards over the flat: and the enclosing walls, from the factory to the river were extended over the ground thus saved, with the express sanction of the authorities. Two years ago, a part of the space was neatly laid out as a shrubbery. The destruction of this was, it seems, the object of the Foo-yuen's incursion. How-quah, the head Hong merchant, with the head linguist, Atom, soon made their appearance at the factory, and afterwards some others of the Hong-merchants. A scene of boisterous anger ensued,

in which even the Hoppo came in for a share of the Foo-yuen's vituperation for his supineness in tolerating English encroachment. "Do you do nothing but eat and sleep," he observed, "that you suffer these things to go on under your eyes? This was under your care, and you should have prevented it." He then gave orders that the bank of the river should be cut away, and the walls taken down, to reduce the enclosure to the same dimensions as before the fire. The linguist replied that he would communicate these orders to the chief of the factory, and see them carried into effect. This increased his excellency's ire. Fetters were sent for to an adjoining Mandarin house, the linguist was bound, and was threatened with instant decapitation. The work of destruction commenced next day, and was completed, by the exertions of about 500 Chinese labourers, working day and night, when not prevented by the rise of the tide. The excavated rubbish was conveyed in boats to about fifty yards off, and was there thrown into the middle of the river. On the 21st of May, the secretary to the select committee arrived in Canton, with remonstrances to the leading officers of the government, which were formally delivered to the Hong merchants in full meeting. He, at the same time, gave up possession of the Company's premises, by handing over the keys in a sealed cover addressed to the Foo-yuen. But the Hong merchants were afraid to present either the one or the other; his excellency having declared that he would listen to nothing on the subject.

12. The mayor of Calais announced that the Commission Sanitaire had decreed that no



vessel coming from Scotland, or any part of the north of England, including Yarmouth, would be admitted into that harbour, and also that all packet boats from London and Dover, as well as all vessels of commerce, were to be furnished with bills of health, delivered by the magistrate at the place of their departure, or by the French consul.

15. HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY, EDINBURGH. — ELECTION RIOTS AT LAUDER. — S. M'Lauchlan, W. Badger, and R. Brown were tried for mobbing and rioting at Lauder, on the 4th of May, and assaulting the Hon. Capt. Maitland and Charles Simson, of Thorewood, and feloniously seizing and carrying off the said Mr. Simson, for the purpose of obstructing the election of a delegate to elect a member of parliament for the Lauder district of burghs. M'Lauchlan and Badger pleaded Not Guilty. Brown pleaded Guilty to being concerned in the abduction of Mr. Simson. He was the driver of the post-chaise in which that gentleman was taken from Lauder. Lord Maitland, Capt. Maitland, and Mr. Boswell, detailed the nature of the riot and assault. Large bodies of men marched into Lauder in the morning. The crowd, who completely filled the street in the neighbourhood of the Cross, opened a sort of lane from Shaw's Inn to the Town Hall, but the party no sooner entered it than an attempt was made to overpower them, and carry off Mr. Simson. This being frustrated, a second effort was made to reach the Council-room, Mr. Stewart, of Alderston, walking first; the party, however, had not proceeded far when the crowd closed in upon them; Lord Mait-

land was thrown down, and, with Mr. Simson, drawn for a considerable way along the street, but, on the parties getting the latter gentleman into their hands, a man called out, "Do not strike him (Lord Maitland), we have gained our object." Mr. Johnston, Procurator Fiscal of Berwickshire, saw a stick raised over Mr. Boswell, and on his (Mr. J.) interfering, he was surrounded and struck. Mr. Boswell stated that he received several blows. None of these gentlemen could identify the panels. Badger and M'Lauchlan were repeatedly seen during the day; the former was not seen to take an active part, but the latter was recognised from his making speeches in favour of "Stewart and Reform," for being diminutive in stature, he was lifted on men's shoulders in order to be seen. The crowd obeyed his orders, by giving three cheers for the Bill and three cheers for Lord John Russell; but no person saw him actively engaged in the assault made on Lord Maitland and Mr. Simson. The Jury found Badger Not Guilty, and the libel against M'Lauchlan Not Proven. Brown was sentenced to nine months' imprisonment.

16. BOW STREET. — EXTRAORDINARY CHARGE OF FELONY. — Mr. James Green, of the firm of Pellat and Green, extensive glass-manufacturers, was charged by a young woman, named Rebecca Hodson, with having robbed her of a gold watch, in the month of May, 1829. She deposed that, two years and a half ago, the defendant accompanied her to her lodgings, and that in the morning when he left her she found that her watch, which she had seen safe a few minutes before he quitted the house, had been stolen. She had never



seen defendant from that time till a fortnight since, when she saw him at Drury-lane Theatre, and the sight of him had such an effect on her that she fainted. On Tuesday evening she saw him again at the theatre, and gave him in charge to a police officer. On cross-examination, she said that she was a native of Boston, in Lincolnshire, and was taken from her home by a gentleman named Hodson, whose name she now retained. She subsequently lived at Southampton under the protection of Sir —, who purchased the watch for her in that place. — The prisoner declared solemnly that he never saw the prosecutrix to his knowledge before the previous night, when she accosted him at Drury-lane Theatre. It was clear that she had mistaken him for some other person whom he had the misfortune to resemble.

The prisoner was admitted to bail, himself in the sum of 1,000*l.*, and two sureties in 500*l.* each. An indictment was preferred against him, but was ignored by the Grand Jury.

19. COURT OF KING'S BENCH. — THE KING ON BEHALF OF MICHAEL SCALES, *v.* MAYOR AND ALDERMEN OF THE CITY OF LONDON. — The court of the Lord Mayor and aldermen of London having made a return to a *mandamus* commanding them to admit and swear in Mr. Michael Scales, who had been elected alderman of the Ward of Portsoken, in the room of Sir James Shaw, the question as to the sufficiency of that return was argued; and Lord Tenterden proceeded to give judgment. The important portion of the return was, that the Court of Aldermen had always possessed and exercised the right of deter-

mining the fitness or unfitness of all persons returned to them from the several wards to fill the office of alderman: and that, on petitions being presented to them by the parties interested, setting forth that any individuals so returned were not fit and proper, and were not qualified to serve in that office, the Court of Aldermen, in the full exercise of their discretion, were at liberty to set aside such election, and had done so in the present case. He was of opinion that that return was sufficient. The aldermen set forth in their return that a petition had been presented to them declaring that Mr. Scales was not a fit or proper person to fill the office of alderman; that they took that petition into consideration; that they examined witnesses; that Mr. Scales was heard by counsel; and they had adjudicated that he was not a competent person to support the dignity and discharge the duty of an alderman of the City of London. Then the question presented itself, was the custom a good or an invalid custom? and against the validity of the custom it was contended that such a custom would be inconsistent with the act of parliament. It appeared to him that the right of election and that of approval were perfectly distinct. When elections took place, there surely might be a power to suspend or annul the powers exercised under that election. There was no power which might not be abused, and the non-existence of the power was not to be inferred from the liability to abuse.

Mr. Justice Parke, Mr. Justice Taunton, and Mr. Justice Patteson concurred. — No peremptory *mandamus* to issue.



21. COLBURN v. HARVEY. — Lord Tenterden delivered the judgment of the court in this case. The question at issue was the validity of a church-rate, made by the select vestry of a district of the parish of St. Giles's Camberwell. The church was built under the act of the 8th of George the Third, the second section of which stated that all district churches or chapels should be built by rates made in the same manner as those levied for repairing parish churches. According to the common law the rates for repairing churches must be made by the churchwardens and inhabitants in vestry assembled; and that principle prevailed in all cases, except where select vestries were established either by statute or by usage. According to the 59th section of George the Third, it was enacted that in all cases, where any district churches or chapels should be built under the former act, and in which there should be no district vestry, a select vestry should be appointed by the commissioners, with the advice of the bishop of the diocese, for the care of such district churches or chapels. It was contended, on the part of the plaintiff, that that section did not extend to the power of making a rate, and that in all cases where the rights of parties were to be abridged, the statute must be construed strictly. The court would be governed by that principle, it being one which had already been acted upon by Lord Hardwicke and other judges. There was no express authority given to the select vestry to make a rate: and the judgment of the court, therefore, was, that the rate must be quashed.

PROCLAMATION AGAINST PO-

LITICAL UNIONS. — “Whereas certain of our subjects, in different parts of our kingdom, have recently promulgated plans for voluntary associations, under the denomination of Political Unions, to be composed of separate bodies, with various divisions and subdivisions, under leaders with a gradation of rank and authority, and distinguished by certain badges, and subject to the general control and direction of a superior committee or council, for which associations no warrant has been given by us, or by any appointed by us, or on our behalf; and whereas, according to the plans so promulgated as aforesaid, a power appears to be assumed of acting independently of the civil magistrates, to whose requisition, calling upon them to be enrolled as constables, the individuals comprising such associations are bound in common with the rest of our subjects to yield obedience: and whereas such associations so constituted and appointed under such separate direction and command, are obviously incompatible with the faithful performance of this duty, at variance with the acknowledged principles of the constitution, and subversive of the authority with which we are invested as the supreme head of the state, for the protection of the public peace; and whereas we are determined to maintain against all encroachments on our Royal Power, those just prerogatives of the crown; which have been given to us for the preservation of the peace and order of society, and for the general advantage and security of our loyal subjects: We have, therefore, thought it our bounden duty, with and by the advice of our Privy Council, to issue this our



Royal Proclamation, declaring all such associations so constituted and appointed as aforesaid, to be unconstitutional and illegal; and earnestly warning all our subjects from entering into such unauthorised combinations, whereby they may draw upon themselves the penalties attending a violation of the laws, and the peace and security of our dominions may be endangered."

28. EDINBURGH CONSERVATIVE MEETING.—This afternoon a public meeting was convened in the Assembly-rooms, George-street, by a requisition signed by not fewer than two hundred and eighty of the most wealthy and respectable citizens of Edinburgh, for the purpose of expressing their loyalty towards the King; their gratification that no further creation of peers has been resorted to with the view of carrying the revolutionary bill; and their detestation of the character and tendency of Political Unions.

The room, which, with the gallery, is calculated to contain no fewer than 2,000 persons, was crammed at an early hour. The meeting itself was, without exception, the most numerous, the most respectable, the most unanimous, and the most enthusiastic which ever met in the assembly Rooms of Edinburgh. Sir John Forbes was in the chair. Professor Wilson, in a speech of splendid eloquence, moved the first resolution. The second resolution was moved by Sir George Clerk, member for the county of Edinburgh. Mr. Anderson, Advocate; Professor Cheape; Mr. Milne, Advocate; Mr. M'Neil, Advocate; Mr. Innes, of Stowe; Mr. Dundas, M.P.; Mr. Pringle, M.P.; and several other gentlemen, delivered very impressive

speeches, which were listened to with a devoted enthusiasm.

THE NEW RUSSIAN TARIFF.—A new tariff of duties was issued by order of the Emperor of Russia. The document occasioned much surprise among the merchants and others connected with the Baltic trade. On the 19th instant, (O. S.) the order was put into force; it imposed an additional duty of  $12\frac{1}{2}$  per cent on all imports not entered before the 19th, with the exception of brimstone, corks, and corkwood; besides which the duty was increased on a great number of other articles.

---

## DECEMBER.

PRETENDED INSPIRATION.—The public attention has been attracted by some extraordinary scenes which have been going on in the Scotch National Church, in Regent-square, of which Mr. Irving is the pastor. On Sunday, the 9th of October, Mr. Irving delivered two sermons on the extraordinary gifts of the Spirit, on each of which occasions the congregation were disturbed by individuals pretending to the miraculous gift of tongues. During the sermon in the morning, a lady (a Miss Hall), thus singularly endowed, was compelled to retire to the vestry, where she was unable (as she said) to restrain herself, and spoke for some time in the unknown tongue, to the great surprise of the congregation. The rev. gentleman resumed the subject in the evening, by discoursing from (or rather expounding) the 12th chapter of the 1st of Corinthians. Towards the conclusion of the exposition, he took occasion



to allude to the event of the morning, and expressed his doubts whether he had done right in restraining the exercise of the gift in the church itself, and compelling the lady to retire to the vestry. At this moment a gentleman in the gallery (a Mr. Taplin, who keeps an academy in Castle-street, Holborn) rose from his seat, and commenced a violent harangue in the unknown tongue. The confusion occasioned was extreme. The whole congregation rose from their seats in affright. Several ladies screamed, and others rushed to the doors. Some supposed the building was in danger; others, that there had been a murder, or an attempt to murder some person in the gallery, insomuch, that one gentleman actually called out to the pew-openers and beadle to "Stop him, and not let him escape." On both occasions the church was extremely crowded, and it would be impossible to describe the confusion produced by this display of fanaticism. There was, indeed, in the strange unearthly sound and extraordinary power of voice, enough to appal the heart of the most stout-hearted. A great part of the congregation standing upon the seats, to ascertain the cause of alarm, while the rev. gentleman, standing with arms extended, and occasionally beckoning them to silence, formed a scene which partook as much of the ridiculous as of the sublime. No attempt was made to stop the individual, and, after two or three minutes, he became exhausted and sat down, and then the rev. gentleman concluded the service.

On the following Sunday, an unusually numerous congregation assembled, in the expectation, no doubt, that similar proceedings

would again take place. In this, however, the auditors were disappointed. Twice, indeed, during the rev. gentleman's prayer, the congregation were startled by a voice, which was understood to proceed from the female endowed with the gift of tongues, but the noise was unaccompanied by any attempt to articulate words or syllables, and appeared to be nothing more than a kind of suppressed hysterical cry. Previous to the usual service of the morning, Mr. Irving remarked that he had something to say on what had occurred in that church on a former occasion. He commenced by observing, that manifestations of the Spirit in the gifts of prophecy and of tongues had been the subject of historical record during the first three centuries, but from that period, up to the present time, they had ceased to be the subject of historical record. It had, however, been the opinion of himself and of others, that these manifestations might be renewed, and, accordingly, they had prayed the Lord to restore them, and it had at last pleased Him to do so. He had raised up among the brethren persons who do so speak the tongues and prophecies—men of God—holy persons, whom he (Mr. Irving) knew to be faithful in the Lord. And here, alluding to the persons who on last Lord's day broke silence, he warned his congregation, in order that, if such a thing occurred again, they might know it was no brawling in the church, but the voice of the Spirit speaking in the tongues. The communication of the Spirit on that occasion, when interpreted, was, "Why will ye flee from the voice of the Lord? The Lord is with ye; if ye flee now, where will ye flee on the day of judgment?" "I say," pro-



ceeded Mr. Irving, "it is not man that did this ; it is the Great Head of the church that has thrust it upon us, and he now waits to see whether we will receive it. Give me liberty to expound the word of the Lord ; give not ear to the opinion of the world, and we shall indeed receive the gifts of the Holy Spirit. The tokens we have already received (and to which I myself have been a reverend listener for the last six months) afford ample evidence of what we may expect. The day of judgment and the Lord's coming are at hand ; and those persons who speak not from their own minds, but from the inspiration of the Lord, are sent forth to announce the event to mankind, and to bid them prepare. I hope that God will raise up many of them ; nay, I am sure he will." After these preliminary observations, Mr. Irving proceeded with his sermon, taking his text from Joel, chap. ii. ver. 28, "And it shall come to pass afterwards, that I will pour out my spirit on all flesh, and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, your old men shall dream dreams, your young men shall see visions." In the course of the morning, he stated that no person, with whose spiritual qualifications he was not well acquainted, would be allowed to display the gift of tongues before the congregation. — In a subsequent Sunday, after he had concluded a sermon on the words, "Try the spirit," a man, named E. Cardale, addressed the vast congregation in the unknown tongue, and afterwards in the vulgar tongue, entreating sinners to come to God, and warning them of the coming of Christ to judgment. A person in the gallery called out, "Blas-

phemy," many hissed, and a strange disturbance took place, which cannot be described. A variety of persons barricaded the doors on both sides of the gallery. About fifty persons then commenced a general harangue, calling upon Mr. Irving to discuss the subject with them, which he declined. During all this disorder, the reverend gentleman commenced his prayer, that the tumult of the people might be stayed. Previous to the immense mass leaving the chapel, he stated, that, in consequence of what had taken place, he should next Sabbath desist from preaching on the subject of "The Gift of the Tongues," and the gift should not be allowed to be exercised in the usual morning and evening service. From this time, the National Scotch Church was opened every morning at half-past six o'clock, for a prayer-meeting, at which the reverend gentleman's deluded followers exhibited the *unknown* tongue. At one of these meetings, the rev. N. Armstrong, a clergyman of the Established Church, publicly stated his belief in the reality of these displays of divine manifestation. — The exhibitions, also, were renewed during the public worship on the Sundays.

2. In Gibraltar an explosion took place in the laboratory, which blew off the roof, and killed two men employed in proving and cleaning unserviceable hand grenades. The consternation was great, as the magazines were very near. There were three or four pounds of gun-powder, which had been saved from the hand grenades, and it is supposed, from the pieces picked up of a shattered grenade, that the accident occurred from its imperfect formation, and



from the coat of rust accumulated, which, with a bit of iron found within, might have ignited and caused the accident. About a week after this, three gunners were killed by the bursting of a gun in the excavation of the rock, and were buried in one grave.

9. PROTESTANT MEETING.—A great Protestant meeting was held in Dublin, to consider the present state of Ireland, as regards the Protestant interest. There were about ninety noblemen and gentlemen of fortune assembled from the different provinces of Ireland. The earl of Roden was in the chair. On the first day (7th), the debate turned chiefly on the propriety and wisdom of establishing a permanent political association. On the second day, the great majority of the meeting resolved to join the already organized Orange Association. Irish Protestants of all denominations were invited to form a junction, and a committee was appointed to carry these resolutions into effect. On the third day, the committee brought up their resolutions, which, after expressing devoted attachment to the king, the principles of the House of Brunswick, and alarm at the spirit of his majesty's councils and the course of their measures, declared that the proposed Irish reform would augment the evils of which the meeting complained, and that the gallant spirit of the Irish Protestants was unsubdued.

10. CAMBRIDGE.—An extraordinary attempt was made to blow up the letter-box of the Post-office, by means of gunpowder, but which happily failed. A student of Trinity-college, named Brane, was taken in the fact. Some suspicious circumstances had, for the last few days, induced the post-

master to set a vigilant watch. About half-past eight in the evening, Brane was observed to be looking about him at the letter-box; he then applied a lighted cigar to a piece of paper which he held in his hand, and dropped a small paper parcel in the box; at this moment a policeman broke a pane of glass in the Post-office window as a signal, and the officers on the watch outside instantly secured him. There was about two ounces of powder in the parcel, which was folded up like a letter, but sewed at the ends, with a touch-paper about nine inches long, communicating with the inside; a string was tied round the middle, with which he suspended it in the letter-hole while he was lighting the touch-paper.

MASSACRE OF THE POLICE.—On Wednesday, the 14th instant, a party of police, under the command of Mr. Gibbons, police chief, stationed at Piltown, went out to protect a process-server, employed in the service of latitats for tithes due to the rev. Hans Hamilton, of Knoctopher, in the county of Kilkenny. A large body of people accompanied the police throughout the day, and made several demands to have the process-server delivered to them, that he might be forced to eat the latitats; but they resorted to no violence. About two o'clock, the party reached a wild part of the common of Carrickshock, three miles from Knoctopher, and were proceeding in narrow files through a lane, the loose stone walls to which were so low, that the lane might be said to form an uninterrupted part of the common. Here the process-server was again demanded, with a promise, that no attack on the police would be made; of course they refused to deliver



him up, and then a young fellow darted in, seized him, tried to drag him from the police, and was immediately shot. A number of shots succeeded, two countrymen dropped dead, and the great body of the people instantly closed in and killed Mr. Gibbons and eleven of the police.—The next day an inquest was held, when John Brown, policeman, was the first witness called up and sworn. He stated, that the men came by their deaths in consequence of the process-server they were guarding being knocked down, and an attack made on the police by a mob armed with pitchforks and other weapons; an immensity of stones were thrown, and eighteen of the men knocked down, before the police fired; that it was the men in the rear ranks who were knocked down; that the front ranks fired about twenty shots, by which they opened themselves a passage to escape; that those shots were not fired till after the process-server was left for dead; that, besides stones, the people were armed with pitchforks, shovels, and things shaped like knife-blades, but seemingly made for the occasion, and placed in the ends of sticks; that, before the battle, he heard frequent cries from the people that blood should be spilled; and that the attack was principally made on the horse-police in the rear, where the greater portion of the mob was.—James Dermody, policeman, having been desired by the Court to state what he knew of the transaction, said: We were protecting the process-server, when the mob said they would not harm the police, but would have the process-server given up to them. Mr. Gibbons expostulated with them, read the passage in the king's speech relative to tithes, and requested they

would have patience, &c. Two stones were thrown, and an attempt was made to snatch the process-server from the party. One of the horsemen was knocked down, and then several stones were thrown. The firing took place in the rear; witness was near the front.—The Jury returned a verdict, “that the police came to their deaths by an attack by a considerable mob of people armed with pitch-forks, stones, and other weapons.”—The whole inquiry occupied precisely twenty minutes.

14. TRIALS OF JOHN WILLIAM HOLLOWAY, AND ANN KENNETT, FOR MURDER.—John William Holloway, and Ann Kennett, were tried for the murder of Celia Holloway, lawful wife of the first-named prisoner.—The prisoner had separated from his wife, and was living in adultery with Ann Kennett, when he induced his wife, on the 24th of July, under promise of again cohabiting with her, to leave her residence, and accompany him to a house in Donkey-row, Brighton, where she had no sooner entered, than he barbarously murdered her. He subsequently conveyed the body to Preston Copse, one mile from Brighton, where he deposited it in a hole, leaving a part of her gown protruding, which led to a discovery of the deed of blood.—After the evidence had been gone through, the Judge summed up the evidence as it affected the female prisoner, and stated, that, if they agreed with him, they would think that the evidence was not sufficient to convict her on this charge, whatever might be done afterwards.—The Jury, after a short deliberation, were of the same opinion as his lordship, and the female prisoner was directed to be removed from the bar.—The



Clerk of the Arraignment then read the following confession, signed by Holloway: "Ann Kennett knew nothing of this circumstance going to happen, until I had got the whole of Celia's clothes in that house. I went home and had her down to the house, and then I acquainted her what I was going to do; she said I had better not do it, for fear of being discovered; I told her I would trust to that if she would assist me; she said yes, she would, and then, as I had got the clothes, we knew not at first hardly how to dispose of them. I said we would pledge some, and burn what would not pledge, and we immediately lotted out what would pledge, and Kennett took them and I believe pledged them, and I then went and fetched Celia. Celia came with me to the south end of North Steine-row. I left Celia there, and told her to wait till I came for her, or called her. I went into the house in North Steine-row; I told Ann she was just by there, and it was agreed that Ann should conceal herself in the cupboard; she did conceal herself in the cupboard. I then went and called Celia; when she was in the house I shut the door; told her I wanted her to wait a little while, because my partner lived up stairs, and he was in bed, and must wait until he got up, and, with that pretence, I kept her in conversation for some time, and at last I asked her to sit down on the stairs, and then, on a pretence of kissing her, I passed the line round her neck, and strangled her. As soon as I passed the line round her neck, I found it was rather more than I could manage, and I called Ann, and God knows she assisted me by taking hold of each end of the rope with me, and she held the rope

with me until the poor girl dropped, and then I held the cord for a time myself; and Ann made use of this expression, 'Do not let your heart fail you.' When I thought she was dead, or nearly dead, I dragged her into a cupboard or coal-hole under the stairs, and under the stairs there are some nails. I did not remove the cord, but took an over-handed knot, and I made the ends fast to the nails, so that she was then hanging by the neck; I proposed then cutting her; Ann Kennett told me to wait until the blood was settled; then, I believe, the next thing we did was to burn the things, the bonnets particularly; the people who went into the house after we left must have seen the wire in the grate, which I took notice of being there; either that or the next night, I cannot call to mind which, we proceeded to cut the body, and I emptied the chaff out of the bed, to have the tick to carry part of the body away in, and then I cut off the head first, and I think the arms I carried with the head. Ann Kennett was present; I never went to the house to do any thing with the body, but what I took Ann Kennett with me; and the day that I brought the head and the other part away, she was to walk behind me, to see if any blood came through: the first attempt we made would not answer, because the blood came through the ticken; Ann told me of it, and we went back and put it into a little box, and then into the ticken; that night, after dark, Ann came down with me, and we brought a small tub with us; I went and got a light, and then some water in the tub, and, after we had placed the body in the box, Ann washed the kitchen to clear it



of the blood, and the next day I borrowed a wheel-barrow, and took it down to the house, and then I borrowed a pick and shovel, and that night Ann and I went down to the house, and we took the box the body was in (I did) on the wheel-barrow. I wheeled the barrow, and Ann Kennett was to follow me with the pick and shovel. She did not know where I was going to. She kept at a small distance from me, until we got near the Hare and Hounds. We turned up the hill and then down the footpath, that leads down to where the body was found. I made an attempt to dig a hole that night, but found it too dark: we just put the box under some bushes near the spot, and also the pick-axe and shovel; Ann Kennett was with me all the time. We then took the wheel-barrow home. We went down again in the morning as soon as it was light, and I dug a hole, with an intent to bury box and all, but I found that would take up too much of my time, because of the roots of the trees. I took the body out, and threw it into the hole. I heaved the body up, and then broke the box up, and hid away the pick and shovel, and Ann Kennett and I went and fetched them away the same night; I had been round once since the body had been buried, to see if every thing was right, and I sent Ann Kennett twice, and she told me she went. I think the people where we lodged must well remember that she went away with me when I went away with the wheel-barrow. She did not go the same road as I did; she went one road and I went another, and I think the people must remember Ann went out early; the next morning we

both went out early, but returned early, before the people, Leavers, were up. A man of the name of Watts, in North Steyne-row, must remember Ann Kennett being there several times with me, and one time in particular, when we were going away, and Ann had then got a bundle of some kind to take away from the house, and a woman that was talking either to Master Watts, or his wife, abused me very much, told me that was not my wife that I was with, and said that she had got a bundle then to pawn (meaning the bundle she had got with her). I forget the person's name that I spoke of, but her husband is a bricklayer. I declare that I do not disclose this out of any envy or malice, and I have done the best I could, ever since I have been confined to conceal it, but I find it impossible; I simply do it to convince the world at large, who are the guilty and who are the innocent. I likewise declare, before God and you, gentlemen, that I feel, if it was my own father, it is out of my power to conceal it."

The Jury found Holloway *Guilty*.

22. DESTRUCTIVE FIRE IN LIVERPOOL.—A most destructive fire broke out in Fenwick-street, in Liverpool. From Water-street, on the west side of Fenwick-street, along nearly half the extent of that street towards Brunswick-street, was a vast pile of warehouses, once entirely occupied by the business of the great house of Lowndes and Co., and lately divided into tenements. This entire range of buildings, with the valuable property stored in it, and the books and papers of several of the parties occupying the premises, has been consumed. A part of the exterior wall only remains erect, tottering



over the scene of destruction. About ten o'clock at night the fire was first observed, and the alarm-bell was immediately rung. Between eleven and twelve, the whole range of premises was in a terrific blaze. Fears were entertained for the safety of the whole of the west side of Castle-street.—The parish offices were on fire, more than once or twice, and were saved only by the most assiduous care, and unremitting and laborious exertions.

27. DESPERATE AFFRAY BETWEEN GAMEKEEPERS AND POACHERS.—About two o'clock, on the morning of the 25th, five watchers, employed by sir Francis Lindley Wood, bart., and T. J. Rimmington, esq., met with a party of from twelve to fourteen poachers, in Hagg Wood, in the parish of Hemsworth, in Yorkshire. The poachers instantly exploded some phosphoric substance in the eyes of the keepers, and fired a gun, which severely wounded one of the keepers in the thigh. Upon this the parties closed, and a desperate struggle took place. Two other guns were fired by the poachers, and the watchers, overpowered by numbers and desperation, after some of them had resisted most bravely, were forced to retire. One of them, however, William Lee (sir F. Wood's farming-servant), was left senseless on the ground, with his arm and skull fractured. He was found so wounded, three-quarters of an hour afterwards (having been dragged some way from the place of combat), with his legs twisted and fixed in brushwood, or what are termed "binders;" his clothes, which were of fustian, were on fire, and his left side was dreadfully burnt. These desperate marauders had set fire to him in his

helpless state, and left him to perish by the joint operation of the combustibles and his wounds.

PROSPECTUS OF THE UNIVERSITY OF DURHAM.—The government to be vested in the dean and chapter, the bishop being visitor.

A chief officer of the College or University to be appointed, with the title of warden; to whom will be committed the ordinary discipline.

*Professors.*—1. Divinity and Ecclesiastical History.—2. Greek and Classical Literature.—Mathematics and Natural Philosophy.

*Readers.*—1. Law—2. Medicine.—3. History, Ancient and Modern. To these may be added Readers in other branches of literature or science, as opportunities offer, or circumstances require.

Teachers of Modern Languages, especially French and German.

*Tutors.*—1. Senior Tutor and Censor.—2. Junior Tutor and Censor. Each to superintend the studies of their respective pupils, and to have the care of their general conduct.

*Students.*—1. Foundation Students, having lodgings and a table provided for them, free of expense.—2. Ordinary Students, maintained at their own cost, but subject in all respects to the college rules of discipline, and to have every academical privilege in common with other students.—3. Occasional Students, to be admitted, under certain restrictions, to attend one or more courses of public lectures, but without other academical privileges.—4. Divinity Students, specially so called, who, though not actual members of the college, may be admitted after due examination and inquiry, and subject to such conditions and regulations as the chapter may hereafter



prescribe, to attend, for a specified time, the lectures of a Divinity professor, and to pursue their theoretical studies under his direction, for the express purpose of qualifying themselves for holy orders.

The course of study required to complete the education of a member of the College will extend to four years. The academical year to commence in October and end in June, being divided into three terms. Terminal and Annual examinations to be made in the presence of the chapter, and the students classed according to their respective proficiency. Prizes to be instituted for the reward of special merit, at the close of each annual examination, and for such particular exercises as may be deemed worthy of public distinction.

The foregoing outline, subject to revision as to its specific statements, may suffice to explain the nature and design of the proposed institution; for which the dean and Chapter, with the aid and co-operation of the bishop, are providing the requisite means of carrying it into effect. It is intended that the College, or University, be opened in October, 1832.

WILL OF THE PRINCE OF CONDE.

—The Parisians have had their attention engaged by the details of a trial, in which their citizen king does not appear to much advantage as duke of Orleans. The late duke of Bourbon, or prince of Conde, died on the 25th or 26th of August, 1830—a month after the revolution of that year. His royal highness was possessed of extensive landed property and immense accumulated wealth. His nearest relatives were

the royal family of France, and the princes of the house of Rohan. To the Orleans family he had generally testified an indifference or a repugnance. Yet the youngest son of the duke of Orleans was left the inheritance of his princely domains and of great accumulations. The young prince owed his good fortune to the influence of Madame de Feucheres, whose maiden name was Dawes, and who having been separated from her husband, lived in the house of the duke of Bourbon for several years before his death. To this lady and the Orleans family the duke's property was almost entirely left. Madame de Feucheres received for her share the Castle and grounds of St. Leu, the forest of Montmorency, other landed possessions, and a large sum of money. The duke d'Aumale, the younger son of the king of the French, was left universal legatee. The princes of the house of Rohan now contest the validity of the will, on the ground that it was extorted from the deceased by force and circumvention. It is even alleged that the duke de Bourbon had resolved to make his escape to England, and to change the destination of his property, in favour of the young duke de Bordeaux, when he opportunely died, or was murdered, as many suspect, for the benefit of his legatees. The letters of the king of the French, when duke of Orleans, to his royal relative, the court which he paid to Madame Feucheres, and his whole system of manœuvres to procure for his family the possessions of the house of Conde, have brought him into much discredit with his subjects.



# APPENDIX TO CHRONICLE.

## LIST OF THE KING'S MINISTERS.

Earl Grey .....	<i>First Lord of the Treasury.</i>
Viscount Althorp .....	<i>Chancellor of the Exchequer.</i>
Lord Brougham .....	<i>Lord Chancellor.</i>
Marquess of Lansdown .....	<i>President of the Council.</i>
Lord Durham.....	<i>Lord Privy-Seal.</i>
Viscount Melbourne .....	<i>Secretary of State for the Home Depart.</i>
Viscount Palmerston .....	<i>Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.</i>
Viscount Goderich.....	<i>Secretary of State for the Colonies.</i>
Right hon. Sir Jas. R. G. Graham, bt.	<i>First Lord of the Admiralty.</i>
Lord Auckland .....	<i>{ Master of the Mint and President of the Board of Trade.</i>
Right hon. Charles Grant .....	<i>President of the Board of Control.</i>
Duke of Richmond .....	<i>Postmaster-General</i>
Lord Holland .....	<i>Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.</i>
Lord John Russell .....	<i>Paymaster of the Forces.</i>
Hon. Edward G. S. Stanley .....	<i>Chief Secretary for Ireland.</i>
Earl of Carlisle .....	

*The above form the CABINET.*

Right hon. Sir Henry Parnell, bart.....	<i>Secretary at War.</i>
Sir James Kempt .....	<i>Master-General of the Ordnance.</i>
Duke of Devonshire .....	<i>Lord Chamberlain</i>
Marquess Wellesley .....	<i>Lord Steward.</i>
Earl of Albemarle .....	<i>Master of the Horse.</i>
Marquess of Winchester .....	<i>Groom of the Stole.</i>
Viscount Duncanon.....	<i>First Commissioner of Land Revenue.</i>
Right hon. Charles Poulett Thomson..	<i>{ Treasurer of the Navy, and Vice- president of the Board of Trade.</i>
Sir Thomas Denman, kt. ....	<i>Attorney General.</i>
Sir William Horne, kt.....	<i>Solicitor General.</i>

## I R E L A N D.

Marquess of Anglesey.....	<i>Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland.</i>
Lord Plunkett.....	<i>Lord-Chancellor.</i>
Lieut.-General sir John Byng.....	<i>Commander of the Forces.</i>
Right hon. Francis Blackburn.....	<i>Attorney-General.</i>
Philip Crampton, esq. ....	<i>Solicitor-General.</i>



## ALPHABETICAL LIST OF THE MEMBERS

OF THE

## HOUSE OF COMMONS,

RETURNED FOR THE TENTH PARLIAMENT OF THE UNITED KINGDOM OF  
GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND.

*Elected June 14th, 1831.*

## ENGLAND AND WALES.

*Abingdon*—J. Maberley  
*Alban's St.*—Sir F. Vincent, R. Godson  
*Aldborough*—C. J. F. Clinton, T. M. Sadler  
*Aldeburgh*—Marq. of Douro, rt. hon. J. W. Croker  
*Amersham*—T. T. Drake, W. T. Drake  
*Andover*—H. A. W. Fellowes, R. Etwall  
*Angleseashire*—Earl of Uxbridge  
*Appleby*—Hon. A. Tufton, ld. Maitland  
*Arundel*—Ld. D. C. Stewart, J. Atkins  
*Ashburton*—W. S. Poyntz, R. Torrens  
*Aylesbury*—Lord Nugent, W. Rickford  
*Banbury*—J. Easthope  
*Barnstaple*—F. Hodgson, J. P. B. Chichester  
*Bassetlaw*—Ld. Newark, hon. A. Duncombe  
*Bath*—Gen. C. Palmer, lord J. Thynne  
*Beaumaris*—Sir B. Williams, bart.  
*Bedfordshire*—Marq. of Tavistock, Sir P. Payne, bart.  
*Bedford*—W. H. Whitbread, F. Polhill  
*Bedwin*—Sir J. Nicholl, J. J. Buxton  
*Beeralston*—Lord Lovaine, D. Lyon  
*Berkshire*—C. Dundas, K. G. Throckmorton  
*Berwick*—Marcus Beresford, sir F. Blake, bt.  
*Beverley*—H. Burton, W. Marshall  
*Bewdley*—W. A. Roberts  
*Bishop's Castle*—E. Rogers, J. L. Knight  
*Blechingley*—Visc. Palmerston, T. H. Villiers  
*Bodmin*—D. Gilbert, H. B. Seymour  
*Boroughbridge*—Sir C. Wetherell, M. Attwood  
*Bossiney*—J. S. Wortley, E. R. Tunno  
*Boston*—G. J. Heathcote, J. Wilks  
*Brackley*—R. H. Bradshaw, J. Bradshaw  
*Bramber*—J. Irving, W. S. Dugdale  
*Breconshire*—Col. T. Wood  
*Brecon*—C. M. R. Morgan  
*Bridgenorth*—W. W. Whitmore, J. Foster  
*Bridgewater*—W. Astell, C. K. Tynte  
*Bridport*—Sir H. St. Paul, bt., H. Warburton  
*Bristol*—J. E. Bailie, E. Protheroe  
*Buckinghamshire*—Marquis Chandos, J. Smith  
*Buckingham*—Sir G. Nugent, bt., sir T. F. Fremantle, bt.  
*Bury St. Edmund's*—Earl of Euston, C. A. Fitzroy  
*Callington*—A. H. B. Baring, hon. E. C. H. Herbert  
*Calne*—T. B. Macaulay, C. R. Fox

*Cambridgeshire*—H. J. Adeane, R. G. Townley  
*Cambridge University*—Rt. hon. H. Goulburn, W. Y. Peel  
*Cambridge*—Marq. Graham, col. Trench  
*Camelford*—Col. Cradock, M. Milbank  
*Canterbury*—Hon. R. Watson, ld. Fordwich  
*Cardiff*—Lord P. J. H. Stuart  
*Cardiganshire*—Col. W. E. Powell  
*Cardigan*—P. Pryse  
*Carlisle*—P. H. Howard, W. James  
*Carmarthenshire*—Sir J. Williams, bart.  
*Carmarthen*—J. Jones  
*Carnarvonshire*—C. W. G. Wynne  
*Carnarvon*—Sir C. Paget  
*Castle Rising*—Lord H. Cholmondeley, hon. F. G. Howard  
*Cheshire*—Lord Belgrave, G. Wilbraham  
*Chester*—Hon. R. Grosvenor, F. C. Offley  
*Chichester*—Lord A. Lennox, J. Smith  
*Chippenham*—J. Neeld, H. G. Boldero  
*Christchurch*—Sir G. H. Rose, G. P. Rose  
*Cirencester*—Lord Apsley, J. Cripps  
*Clithero*—Hon. R. Curzon, hon. P. F. Cust  
*Cockermouth*—J. H. Lowther, sir J. Scarlett  
*Colchester*—D. W. Harvey, W. Mayhew  
*Corfe Castle*—G. Banks, P. J. Miles  
*Cornwall*—E. W. Pendarves, sir C. Lemon  
*Coventry*—E. Ellice, H. Lytton-Bulwer  
*Cricklade*—R. Gordon, T. Colley  
*Cumberland County*—Rt. hon. sir J. Graham, bt., W. Blamire  
*Dartmouth*—Capt. J. Bastard, A. H. Holdsworth.  
*Denbighshire*—Sir W. W. Wynne, bt.  
*Denbigh*—R. M. Biddulph  
*Derbyshire*—Ld. G. H. Cavendish, hon. G. J. Vernon.  
*Derby*—H. F. C. Cavendish, E. Strutt  
*Devizes*—J. Pearse, G. W. Taylor  
*Devonshire*—Lord Ebrington, rt. hon. lord J. Russell  
*Dorsetshire*—E. B. Portman, lord Ashley  
*Dorchester*—R. Williams, hon. A. H. Ashley Cooper  
*Dover*—Rt. hon. C. P. Thompson, R. H. Thompson  
*Downton*—T. Creevey, hon. P. P. Bouverie  
*Droitwich*—J. Foley, sir T. Winnington  
*Dunwich*—F. Barne, earl of Brecknock  
*Durham County*—W. Russell, sir H. Williamson



- Durham City*—W. R. C. Chaytor, hon. A. Trevor  
*East Loos*—H. T. Hope, T. A. Kemmis  
*Essex*—C. C. Western, hon. W. P. T. Long Wellesley  
*Evesham*—Sir C. Cockerell, bt., T. Hudson  
*Exeter*—L. W. Buck, J. W. Buller  
*Eye*—Sir E. Kerrison, bt., W. Burge  
*Flintshire*—E. M. L. Mostyn  
*Flint*—H. Glynn  
*Fowey*—Lord Brudenell, J. C. Severn  
*Gatton*—Vt. Pollington, hon. J. Ashley  
*Germans, St.*—C. Ross, W. M. Praed  
*Glamorganshire*—C. R. M. Talbot  
*Gloucestershire*—Sir W. B. Guise, bt., hon. H. G. F. Moreton  
*Gloucester City*—Col. E. Webb, M. F. F. Berkeley.  
*Grantham*—G. E. Welby, J. Hughes  
*Great Grimsby*—Lord Loughborough, hon. H. Fitzroy  
*Grinstead, East*—Ld. Holmesdale, F. R. West  
*Guildford*—J. Mangles, C. F. Norton  
*Hampshire*—Sir J. Macdonald, bt. C. S. Lefevre  
*Harwich*—Rt. hon. J. C. Herries, G. R. Dawson  
*Haslemere*—Sir J. Beckett, bt., W. Holmes  
*Hastings*—F. North, J. A. Warre  
*Haverfordwest*—Sir R. B. P. Phillips  
*Hedon*—Sir T. Constable, bt., R. Ferrand  
*Helston*—Lord J. Townshend, J. Pechell  
*Herefordshire*—Sir R. Price, bt., K. Hoskins  
*Hereford*—Lord Eastnor, E. B. Clive  
*Hertfordshire*—Sir J. S. Sebright, bt., N. Calvert  
*Hertford*—T. S. Duncombe, J. Currie  
*Heytesbury*—Sir G. Staunton, bt., E. H. A'Court  
*Higham Ferrers*—Hon. J. B. Ponsonby  
*Hindon*—J. Weyland, E. J. Stanley  
*Honiton*—Sir G. Warrender, bt., H. B. Lott  
*Horsham*—E. of Surrey, N. W. R. Colborne  
*Huntingdonshire*—Lord Mandeville, J. B. Rooper  
*Huntingdon*—J. Peel, F. Pollock  
*Hythe*—S. Marjoribanks, J. Loch  
*Ichester*—Dr. Lushington, hon. E. R. Petre  
*Ipswich*—J. Morrison, R. Wason  
*Ive's, St.*—J. Hulse, E. E. Lytton Bulwer  
*Kent*—T. L. Hodges, T. Rider  
*King's Lynn*—Lord W. P. Lennox, ld. G. F. C. Bentinck  
*Kingston-upon-Hull*—G. Schonswar, W. B. Wrightson  
*Knaresborough*—Sir J. Macintosh, lord Waterpark  
*Lancashire*—Lord Stanley, B. Heywood  
*Lancaster*—T. Greene, P. M. Stewart  
*Launceston*—J. Brogden, sir J. Malcolm  
*Leicestersh.*—C. M. Phillips, T. Paget  
*Leicester*—W. Evans, W. Ellis  
*Leominster*—W. B. Evans, T. Brayen  
*Lewes*—T. R. Kemp, sir C. R. Blunt, bt.
- Lichfield*—Sir G. Hanson, sir E. D. Scott  
*Lincolnshire*—Sir W. A. Ingilby, bt., hon. C. A. W. Pelham  
*Lincoln*—C. D. Sibthorp, G. F. Heneage  
*Liskeard*—Lord Elliot, sir W. Pringle, bt.  
*Liverpool*—Lord Sandon, W. Ewart  
*London*—Alderman Wood, alderman Waithman, alderman Thompson, alderman Venables  
*Lostwithiel*—Hon. E. Cust, lord Valletort  
*Ludgershall*—Sir S. Graham, bt. E. T. Foley  
*Ludlow*—Lord Clive, hon. R. H. Clive  
*Lyme Regis*—Hon S. H. Fane, col. J. T. Fane  
*Lymington*—G. Burrard, W. A. Mackinnon  
*Maidstone*—A. W. Roberts, C. J. Barnett  
*Maldon*—T. B. Lennard, Q. Dick  
*Malmesbury*—Sir C. Forbes, bt., J. Forbes  
*Malton*—Sir H. G. Knight, C. C. Pepys  
*Marl'bro'*—W. J. Banks, T. H. S. B. Estcourt  
*Marlow, Great*—O. Williams, T. P. Williams  
*Mawes, St.*—G. G. W. Pigott, sir E. B. Sugden  
*Merionethshire*—Sir R. W. Vaughan, bt.  
*Michael's, St.*—Hon. L. Kenyon, hon. W. S. Best  
*Middlesex*—G. Byng, J. Hume  
*Medhurst*—G. Smith, M. T. Smith  
*Milborne Port*—G. S. Byng, P. C. Crampton  
*Minehead*—J. F. Luttrell, lord Villiers  
*Monmouthshire*—Lord G. C. H. Somerset, W. A. Williams  
*Monmouth*—Marquess of Worcester  
*Montgomeryshire*—Rt. hon. C. W. W. Wynn  
*Montgomery*—H. Clive  
*Morpeth*—Hon. W. Howard, W. Ord  
*Newark*—T. Wilde, W. Handley  
*Newcastle-under-Lyne*—W. H. Miller, E. Peel  
*Newcastle-upon-Tyne*—Sir M. W. Ridley, bt., J. Hodgson  
*Newport, Cornwall*—Rt. hon. sir H. Hardinge, bt., Lord Grimston  
*Newport, Isle of Wight*—W. Mount, J. J. H. Vere  
*Newton, Lanc.*—T. Leigh, T. Holdsworth  
*Newtown, Isle of Wight*—H. Gurney, sir W. Horne  
*Norfolk Co.*—T. W. Coke, sir W. Folkes, bt.  
*Northallerton*—Hon. W. S. Lascelles, sir J. Beresford, bt.  
*Northamptonshire*—Ld. Althorp, ld. Milton  
*Northampton*—Sir G. Robinson, bt. R. V. Smith  
*Northumberland*—T. W. Beaumont, lord Howick  
*Norwich*—R. H. Gurney, rt. hon. R. Grant  
*Nottinghamshire*—J. S. Lumsley, J. E. Dennison  
*Nottingham*—Sir R. Fergusson, sir T. Denman  
*Okehampton*—Sir R. R. Vyvyan, J. T. Hope  
*Orford*—S. H. Kilderbee, sir H. F. Cooke  
*Oxfordshire*—G. G. Harcourt, R. Weyland



*Oxford University*—T. G. B. Estcourt, sir R. Inglis, bt.  
*Oxford City*—J. H. Langston, W. Hughes Hughes  
*Pembrokeshire*—Sir J. Owen, bt.  
*Pembroke*—H. O. Owen  
*Penryn*—J. W. Freshfield, C. Stewart  
*Peterboro'*—Sir R. Heron, bt. J. N. Fazakerley  
*Petersfield*—Sir W. Jolliffe, bt., H. Jolliffe  
*Plymouth*—Sir T. B. Martin, G. Cockburn  
*Plympton*—Sir C. Domville, G. C. Antrobus  
*Pontefract*—Earl of Mexborough, hon. H. V. S. Jerningham  
*Poole*—B. L. Lester, Right hon. Sir J. Byng  
*Portsmouth*—J. B. Carter, F. Baring, jun.  
*Preston*—J. Wood, H. Hunt  
*Queenborough*—J. Capel, C. Grant  
*Radnorshire*—Right hon. T. F. Lewis  
*Radnor (New)*—R. Price  
*Reading*—C. F. Palmer, C. Russell  
*Richmond*—Hon. sir R. L. Dundas, bt. hon. J. C. Dundas  
*Ripon*—G. Spence, L. H. Petit  
*Rochester*—R. Bernal, J. Mills  
*Romney (Old)*—Sir E. C. Dering, W. Miles  
*Rutlandshire*—Sir G. Noel, bt. sir G. Heathcote, bt.  
*Rye*—D. L. Evans, T. Pemberton  
*Ryegate*—C. P. Yorke, J. Yorke  
*Saltash*—F. Villiers, B. Walrond  
*Sandwich*—J. Marryatt, sir E. T. Troubridge  
*Salisbury (New)*—Hon. D. P. Bouverie, W. Wyndham  
*Salisbury (Old)*—J. Alexander, J. D. Alexander  
*Scarborough*—Right hon. C. M. Sutton, gen. Phipps  
*Seaford*—J. Fitzgerald, W. Lyon  
*Shaftesbury*—E. Penrhyn, W. L. Maberley  
*Shoreham*—Sir C. M. Burrell, bt. H. Howard  
*Shrewsbury*—R. Jenkins, R. A. Slaney  
*Shropshire*—Sir R. Hill, bt.; J. C. Pelham  
*Somersetshire*—W. G. Langton, E. A. Sanford  
*Southampton*—A. Atherley, J. S. Penleaze  
*Southwark*—C. Calvert, W. Brougham  
*Staffordshire*—Sir J. Wrottesley, bt. E. J. Littleton  
*Stafford*—J. Campbell, T. Gisborne  
*Stamford*—Lord T. Cecil, C. Tennysón  
*Steyning*—G. R. Philips, E. Blount  
*Stockbridge*—J. Barham, right hon. sir S. Canning.  
*Sudbury*—sir J. B. Walsh, bart. D. C. Wrangham  
*Suffolk*—Sir H. Bunbury, bt. C. Tyrell  
*Surrey*—W. J. Denison, J. I. Briscoe  
*Sussex*—H. Curteis, jun. Lord J. G. Lennox  
*Tamworth*—Sir R. Peel, bt. lord C. Townshend

*Tavistock*—J. H. Hawkins, F. Russell  
*Taunton*—H. Labouchere, E. T. Bainbridge  
*Tewkesbury*—J. E. Dowdeswell, J. Martin  
*Thetford*—Lord J. Fitzroy, F. Baring  
*Thirsk*—Sir R. Frankland, sir R. G. Russell  
*Tiverton*—Hon. G. D. Ryder, Spen. Percival  
*Totness*—Right hon. T. P. Courtenay, C. B. Baldwin  
*Tregony*—C. G. J. Arbutnot, J. Mackillop  
*Truro*—Lord Encombe, N. W. Peach  
*Wallingford*—T. C. Leigh, R. Knight  
*Wareham*—G. H. Calcraft, C. Wood  
*Warwickshire*—F. Lawley, sir G. Skipwith  
*Warwick*—T. Thoms, E. B. King.  
*Wells*—J. E. Vaughan, J. L. Lee  
*Wendover*—A. Smith, S. Smith  
*Wenlock*—Hon. G. C. W. Forrester, P. B. Thompson  
*Weobley*—Ld. H. Thynne, lord W. Thynne  
*Westbury*—Sir R. F. Lopes, H. F. Stephenson  
*West Looe*—Sir C. Hulse, bt. C. Buller, jun.  
*Westminster*—Sir F. Burdett, bt. sir J. C. Hobhouse  
*Westmoreland*—Lord Lowther, A. Nowell  
*Weymouth & Melcombe Regis*—Col. Gordon, M. Urè, T. F. Buxton, C. B. Wall  
*Whitechurch*—Sir S. Scott, bt. hon. J. R. Townshend  
*Wigan*—R. Thicknesse, J. H. Kearsley  
*Wilton*—J. H. Penruddocke, J. Dawkins  
*Wiltshire*—Sir J. D. Astley, bt. J. Bennet  
*Winchelsea*—J. Williams, J. Brougham  
*Winchester*—P. St. J. Mildmay, J. B. East  
*Windsor*—J. Ramsbottom, Right hon. E. G. S. Stanley  
*Woodstock*—Lord C. S. Churchill, lord Stormont  
*Wotton Bassett*—Ld. Mahon, ld. Porchester  
*Worcestershire*—Hon. T. H. Foley, hon. F. Spencer  
*Worcester*—Col. Davis, G. R. Robinson  
*Wycombe*—Sir T. Baring, hon. R. J. Smith  
*Yarmouth*—Hon. G. Anson, C. E. Rumbold  
*Yarmouth, Isle of Wight*—Sir H. Willoughby, bart. C. C. Cavendish  
*Yorkshire*—Lord Morpeth, sir J. V. B. Johnstone, J. C. Ramsden, G. Strickland  
*York*—S. A. Bayntun, hon. T. Dundas

## SCOTLAND.

*Aberdeenshire*—Hon. William Gordon  
*Aberdeen*—Horatio Ross  
*Argyleshire*—Walter F. Campbell  
*Ayrshire*—William Blair  
*Ayr*—Thomas Francis Kennedy  
*Banffshire*—John Morison  
*Berwickshire*—Hon. Anthony Maitland  
*Bute and Caithness-shire*—George Sinclair  
*Cromarty and Nairn*—Duncan Davidson  
*Crail and Anstruther*—Andrew Johnston



*Dumbartonshire*—Lord M. W. Graham  
*Dumfries-shire*—J. J. Hope Johnstone  
*Dumfries*—W. R. K. Douglas  
*Dysart*—Robert Ferguson  
*Edinburghshire*—Sir George Clerk, bart.  
*Edinburgh*—R. A. Dundas  
*Elginshire*—Hon. Francis-William Grant  
*Elgin*—Sir W. G. Cummins, bart.  
*Fifeshire*—James Lyndsay  
*Forfarshire*—Hon. Donald Ogilvie  
*Forfar and Perth*—Right hon. F. Jeffery  
*Fortrose*—C. L. Bruce  
*Glasgow*—Joseph Dixon  
*Haddingtonshire*—James Balfour  
*Haddington*—Sir Adolph.-J. Dalrymple, bt.  
*Inverkeithing*—James Johnston  
*Inverness-shire*—Right hon. Charles Grant  
*Kincardineshire*—Hon. Hugh Arbuthnot  
*Kinross-shire*—Charles Adam  
*Kirkcudbright*—R. C. Ferguson  
*Kirkwall*—James Loch  
*Lanarkshire*—Hon. Charles Douglas  
*Linlithgowshire*—Sir Alexander Hope  
*Orkneyshire*—George Trail  
*Peebles-shire*—Sir John Hay  
*Perthshire*—Right hon. sir Geo. Murray, bt.  
*Renfrewshire*—Sir M.-Shaw Stewart, bt.  
*Ross-shire*—James Alex. S. Mackenzie  
*Roxburghshire*—Henry Francis Scott  
*Selkirkshire*—Alexander Pringle  
*Selkirk and Peebles*—W. Downe Gillon  
*Stirlingshire*—W. R. Ramsay  
*Sutherlandshire*—Roderick M'Leod  
*Wigtonshire*—Sir Andrew Agnew, bt.  
*Wigton*—Edward Stewart

## IRELAND.

*Antrim Co.*—Hon. J. B. R. O'Neil, earl of Belfast  
*Armagh Co.*—Lord Acheson, C. Brownlow  
*Armagh*—Sir J. W. H. Brydges  
*Athlone*—R. Handcock  
*Bandon Bridge*—Sir A. W. Clifford  
*Belfast*—Sir A. Chichester, bt.  
*Carlow Co.*—W. Blackney, sir J. M. Doyle  
*Carlow*—Viscount Tullamore  
*Carrickfergus*—Lord G. A. Hill  
*Cashel*—Philip Pusey  
*Cavan Co.*—H. Maxwell, John Young  
*Clare Co.*—W. N. M'Namara, M. O'Connell  
*Clonmell*—Eyre Coote  
*Coleraine*—W. Taylor Copeland  
*Cork Co.*—Hon. R. King, lord Boyle  
*Cork City*—Hon. J. Boyle, D. Callaghan  
*Donegall Co.*—Sir E. S. Hayes, E. M. Connolly

*Down Co.*—Lord A. Hill, visc. Castlereagh  
*Downpatrick*—E. S. Ruthven  
*Drogheda*—Thomas Wallace  
*Dublin Co.*—Lord Brabazon, col. White  
*Dublin City*—F. Shaw, visc. Ingestrie  
*Dublin University*—T. Lefroy  
*Dundalk*—J. E. Gordon  
*Dungannon*—Hon. J. J. Knox  
*Dungarvon*—Hon. G. Lamb  
*Ennis*—Right hon. W. F. V. Fitzgerald  
*Enniskillen*—Hon. A. H. Cole  
*Fermanagh*—M. Archdall, visc. Cole  
*Galway Co.*—J. S. Lambert, Sir J. Burke, bt.  
*Galway*—J. J. Bodkin  
*Kerry Co.*—Dan. O'Connell, F. W. Mullins  
*Kildare Co.*—R. M. O'Ferral, sir Jonah W. Hart, bt.  
*Kilkenny Co.*—Earl of Ossory, lord Duncannon  
*Kilkenny*—N. P. Leader  
*King's Co.*—T. Bernard, lord Oxmantown  
*Kinsale*—J. Russell  
*Leitrim Co.*—J. M. Clements, S. White  
*Limerick Co.*—Hon. R. H. Fitzgibbon, col. O'Grady  
*Limerick*—T. Spring Rice  
*Lisburne*—H. Heynell  
*Londonderry Co.*—Sir R. Bateson, bt., T. Jones  
*Londonderry City*—Sir A. R. Ferguson  
*Longford Co.*—Visc. Forbes, A. Lefroy  
*Louth Co.*—R. L. Sheil, sir P. Bellew, bt.  
*Mallow*—C. D. O. Jephson  
*Mayo Co.*—J. Browne, D. Browne.  
*Meath Co.*—Lord Killeen, K. G.  
*Monagan Co.*—Hon. C. D. Blaney, hon. H. R. Westenra  
*Newry*—Hon. J. H. Knox  
*Portarlington*—Right hon. sir W. Rae, bt.  
*Queen's Co.*—Sir H. Parnell, bt. sir C. Coote, bt.  
*Roscommon Co.*—O. O'Connor, A. French  
*New Ross*—W. Wigram  
*Sligo Co.*—E. S. Cooper, Alex. Percival  
*Sligo*—John Wynne  
*Tipperary Co.*—T. Wyse, J. H. Hutchinson  
*Tralee*—Walker Ferrand.  
*Tyrone Co.*—Hon. H. L. Corry, sir Hugh Stewart  
*Waterford Co.*—Sir R. Musgrave, R. Power  
*Waterford*—Right hon. sir J. Newport, bt.  
*Westmeath Co.*—G. Rochfort, M. L. Chapman  
*Wexford Co.*—H. Lambert, R. Shapland  
*Wexford*—Charles Arthur Walker  
*Wicklow Co.*—J. Grattan, R. Howard  
*Youghall*—Hon. G. Ponsonby



## SHERIFFS FOR THE YEAR 1831.

<i>Bedfordshire</i> .....	Samuel Charles Whitbread, of Cardington, esq.
<i>Berkshire</i> .....	Charles Eyston, of East Hendred, esq.
<i>Bucks</i> .....	Henry Andrewes Uthwatt, of Great Linford, esq.
<i>Cambridge and Huntingdonshire</i> .....	John Bendyshe, of Kneesworth, esq.
<i>Cheshire</i> .....	Sir Thomas Stanley Massay Stanley, of Hooton, bart.
<i>Cumberland</i> .....	John Taylor, of Dockray Hall, esq.
<i>Cornwall</i> .....	John Hearle Tremayne, of Heligan, esq.
<i>Derbyshire</i> .....	Sir Charles Henry Colvile, of Duffield, knt.
<i>Devonshire</i> .....	Sir Bouchier Palk Wray, of Tavistock, bart.
<i>Dorsetshire</i> .....	The Hon. Henry Dawson Damer, of Milton Abbey.
<i>Essex</i> .....	William Davis, of Leyton, esq.
<i>Gloucestershire</i> .....	Sir Thomas Crawley Bovey, of Flaxley Abbey, bart.
<i>Hampshire</i> .....	Sir Hen. Jos. Tichborne, of Tichborne Park, bart.
<i>Herefordshire</i> .....	John Arkwright, of Hampton Court, esq.
<i>Hertfordshire</i> .....	Augustus Smith, of Ashlyn's Hall, esq.
<i>Kent</i> .....	Baden Powell, of Speldhurst, esq.
<i>Leicestershire</i> .....	George John Butler Danvers, of Swithland, esq.
<i>Lincolnshire</i> .....	Henry Bacon Hickman, of Thonnock-house, esq.
<i>Monmouthshire</i> .....	William Hollis, of Mounton, esq.
<i>Norfolk</i> .....	John Angerstein, of Weeting, esq.
<i>Northamptonshire</i> .....	Beriah Botfield of Norton Hall, esq.
<i>Northumberland</i> .....	George Silvertop, of Minster Acres, esq.
<i>Nottinghamshire</i> .....	Thomas Moore, of Ruddington, esq.
<i>Oxfordshire</i> .....	Sir Henry John Lambert, of Aston, bart.
<i>Rutlandshire</i> .....	Thomas Birch Reynardson, of Essendine, esq.
<i>Shropshire</i> .....	Sir Edward Joseph Smythe, of Acton Burnell, bart.
<i>Somersetshire</i> .....	Thomas Shewell Bailward, of Horsington, esq.
<i>Staffordshire</i> .....	Thomas Fitzherbert, of Sumnerton Park, esq.
<i>Suffolk</i> .....	John Read, of Primrose Hill, Hollrook, esq.
<i>Surrey</i> .....	Harvey Combe, of Cobham, Park, esq.
<i>Sussex</i> .....	William Courthorpe Mabott, of Uckfield, esq.
<i>Warwickshire</i> .....	George Lucy, of Charlecote, esq.
<i>Wiltshire</i> .....	Paul Methuen, of Corsham House, esq.
<i>Worcestershire</i> .....	Osman Ricardo, of Bromsberrow, esq.
<i>Yorkshire</i> .....	Sir Henry James Goodricke, of Ribstone Hall, bart.

## SOUTH WALES.

<i>Breconshire</i> .....	Ebenezer Fuller Maitland, of Garth, esq.
<i>Cardiganshire</i> .....	John Palmer Bruce Chichester, of Llanbadarn Faur, esq.
<i>Carmarthenshire</i> .....	Edward Hamlyn Adams, of Middleton Hall, esq.
<i>Glamorganshire</i> .....	Richard Hoare Jenkins, of Lanharran, esq.
<i>Pembrokeshire</i> .....	John Mirehouse, of Brownsiad, esq.
<i>Radnorshire</i> .....	Thomas Duppa, of Llanshay, esq.

## NORTH WALES.

<i>Angleseyshire</i> .....	Owen Owen, of Llanfigael, esq.
<i>Carnarvonshire</i> .....	Rice Thomas, of Coedhelen, esq.
<i>Denbighshire</i> .....	Wilson Jones, of Gellygynan, esq.
<i>Flintshire</i> .....	Sir Stephen Richard Glynn, of Hawarden Castle, bart.
<i>Merionethshire</i> .....	Hugh Lloyd, of Cefnbodig, esq.
<i>Montgomeryshire</i> .....	Robert Maurice Bonnor Maurice, of Bodynfol, esq.



## BIRTHS.

## JANUARY.

1. At Dan-y-Graig House, Newton, Glamorganshire, the wife of the Rev. H. Elliot Graham, a son.

2. At Bloxworth House, Dorset, the wife of John Hesketh Lethbridge, esq. a son.

— At Westhorpe, Nottinghamshire, the wife of R. Warrand, esq. late major 6th Dragoons, a son.

10. The wife of J. T. Justice, esq. of Parliament-street, a daughter.

— At Sledmere, the lady of sir Tatton Sykes, bart. a son.

11. Saville-street, Burlington Gardens, the wife of Henry Bosanquet, esq. a daughter.

— At Walbury, Essex, the wife of col. Johnson; a son.

13. At Beaufort Castle, county Inverness, hon. Mrs. Fraser, of Lovat, a son.

15. At Bishop's Penn, Jamaica, the wife of the Bishop of Jamaica, a son.

16. At Brighton, lady Frances Sandon, a son and heir.

— In Torrington-square, the wife of E. R. Daniell, esq. barrister-at-law, a daughter.

— The lady of George Fortescue Turville, esq. a son and heir.

17. The wife of lieutenant-col. Standish O'Grady, a daughter.

— At Hatchlands, the wife of W. Holme Sumner, esq. a daughter.

20. At Chicknell, Salop, hon. Mrs. Taylor, a son.

21. At Abbot's Leigh, county Somerset, the wife of R. Bright, esq. a son.

25. At Tenby, South Wales, the wife of col. Mason Boyd, Bengal army, a son.

31. At Bath, the right hon. lady Spencer Churchill, a daughter.

## FEBRUARY.

7. At the Ray, Berkshire, the wife of capt. sir John Phillimore, C. B. a son.

8. At his Prebendal House, Canterbury, the wife of the Rev. J. Peel, a son.

12. At Arundel, the wife of the hon. and rev. Edward J. Turner, a daughter, his fifteenth child.

15. In Bolton-street, the lady of sir Philip Sidney, M.P. a daughter.

16. The wife of the rev. Dr. Bridges, president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, a daughter.

19. At Mersham-hatch, the lady of sir Edward Knatchbull, a son.

22. At Waterford, the lady of lieutenant-col. W. Vincent, E. I. C., a son.

24. In Harley-street, the wife of capt. Berkeley Maxwell, R.N., a son.

25. The lady of captain sir J. Gordon Sinclair, bart. R.N., of Stevenson, near Haddington, a daughter.

26. At Badminton, the right. hon. lady Isabella Kingscote, a daughter.

## MARCH.

1. At Dunstable-house, Richmond, the lady of sir H. Loraine Baker, bart. a daughter.

— At Brighton, the lady of lieutenant-col. Baillie, a daughter.

4. At Calverton, near Stoney Stratford, the hon. Mrs. Charles Percival, a daughter.

5. At Serlby-hall, Notts, the viscountess Galway, a daughter.

6. At Bushmead Priory, Bedford, the wife of Hugh Wade Gery, esq. a son and heir.

7. The wife of G. Heneage, esq. of Compton Basset House, Devon, a son and heir.

— In Whitehall-place, lady Henley, a son.

— The lady of lieutenant-col. Alex. Stewart, E.I.C. a son.

— At sir William Ouseley's, Foley-place, the wife of W. G. Ouseley, esq. of his majesty's legation in the United States, a son.

9. At Worthing, the wife of the hon. capt. A. R. Turner, R.N., a son.

12. At Clifton, the lady of sir S. Stewart, bart. a daughter.

22. At Edinburgh, the countess of Hopetoun, a son and heir.

31. At Coleorton-hall, Leicestershire, the lady of sir George Beaumont, bart. a son.

— In Harley-street, the hon. Mrs. W. Rodney, a daughter.

— In Eaton-place, the wife of C. Brownlow, esq. M.P. a son and heir.

— In Charles-street, Berkeley-square, lady Julia Hobhouse, a daughter.

— The lady of the hon. capt. Maude, C.B., R.N. a daughter.

— In Gower-street, the wife of Mr. serj. Russell, a son.

## APRIL.

2. At Stonor Park, Oxfordshire, the wife of Thomas Stonor, jun. esq. a son.



## BIRTHS.

7. The wife of the rev. Wadham Knatchbull, prebendary of Wells, a son.

18. In Whitehall-place, lady H. Cholmondeley, a daughter.

20. At Shortgrove, Essex, the seat of sir John St. Aubyn, bart. the wife of the rev. D. B. Lennard, a daughter.

22. At Brayfield House, Bucks, the wife of lieut.-col. Bouchier, a son.

— At Anne's Grove, the hon. Mrs. Arthur G. Annesley, a son.

24. In North Audley-street, the wife of W. Bulwer, esq. a daughter.

27. At Cambridge, the wife of the rev. professor Scholefield, a son.

29. In Portland-street, the wife of lieut.-col. Healy, a daughter.

*Lately.* At Southampton, the wife of lieut.-col. G. Hely, a daughter.

— At Coolhurst, Horsham, the right hon. lady Eliz. Dickins, a son.

## MAY.

2. In Grosvenor-square, the countess of Wilton, a son.

8. At Bromley House, lady Sarah Murray, a son.

18. In Upper Harley-street, the wife of Rich. Jenkins, esq. M.P. a son.

— At the Palace, Fulham, Mrs. Blomfield, the lady of the bishop of London, a son.

19. At the Rectory, East Horsley, hon. Mrs. Arthur Percival, a son.

20. At Halls, Holt, Wilts, the wife of lieut.-col. T. W. Forster, a daughter.

21. In Park-place, St. James's, the marchioness of Worcester, a daughter.

22. At the Rectory, East Lavant, Sussex, the wife of the rev. Henry Legge, a son.

26. The hon. Mrs. Smith, Belgrave-street, a son.

## JUNE.

2. At Clifton, the wife of lieut.-col. Plenderleith, a son.

6. The wife of W. Cole Medlycott, esq. of Milborne Port, a son and heir.

9. In Bryanstone-square, the wife of Joseph Hume, esq. M.P. a son.

22. At Tunbridge-wells, the wife of col. Hall, of Wimbledon, a son.

## JULY.

3. At Wendover, the wife of Abel Smith, esq. M.P. a daughter.

12. At Weston Underwood, county

Derby, the wife of the hon. and rev. Alfred Curzon, a son.

25. In Grosvenor-street, the countess of Kinnoul, a son.

28. In Wilton-crescent, lady Catherine Bulkeley, a son.

— On Richmond-hill, the wife of B. J. L. Praed, esq. a son.

## AUGUST.

13. At Great Mylees, the viscountess Chetwynd, a daughter.

13. At Betchworth-castle, near Dorking, the wife of D. Barclay, esq. a son.

16. In Charles-street, Berkeley-square, the lady of Chas. Douglas Halford, esq. a son.

19. At Brighton, the wife of col. Payne, a son.

— In the Regent's Park, the lady of sir J. B. Johnstone, M.P. a daughter.

20. At Addlestrop, Gloucestershire, the hon. Mrs. Frederick Twisleton, a son.

— At Salisbury, the hon. Mrs. Pare, wife of the rev. Mr. Pare, of Cranbourne, county Dorset, a daughter.

21. In Eaton-square, lady Agnes Byng, a son.

22. At Dale Castle, county Pembroke, the wife of J. P. A. Lloyd Phipps, esq. a daughter.

26. At the Rosery, Barnes Common, the wife of T. Crofton Croker, esq. a son.

31. In Eaton-place, Belgrave-square, lady Augusta Baring, a son.

## SEPTEMBER.

1. At Kilve Court, Somerset, the wife of F. F. Luttrell, esq. a son.

8. In Stanhope-street, the lady Lilford, a daughter.

9. At Montagu House, the duchess of Buccleugh, a son and heir.

12. At Windmill-hill, Sussex, the seat of her father, E. J. Curteis, esq. late M.P. for the county, the wife of Howard Elphinstone, esq. a son.

15. At Mansell-house, Somerset, the lady of lieut.-gen. sir John Slade, bart., a son.

20. At Dorchester, the wife of col. Halyburton, a son.

22. At Tunbridge Wells, the wife of col. Hull, Wimbledon, a son.

24. At St. David's College, Lampeter, the wife of the rev. A. Ollivant, the vice principal, a daughter.

*Lately.* At Hyde-park-corner, the



## BIRTHS.

lady of sir Edmund Antrobus, bart. a son.

— At the duke of Beaufort's, Grosvenor-square, lady Georgina Ryder, a daughter.

— The right hon. lady Byron, a son.

— At Arnewood Lodge, the lady of F. R. West, esq. M.P. a daughter.

*Lately.* At Enstone, Oxford, lady Granville Somerset, a son.

— At Hill House, Tooting, Surrey, the wife of alderman Venables, M.P. a daughter.

## OCTOBER.

2. At Sidmouth, the wife of lieut.-col. Slessor, a son.

11. At Broomhall, the countess of Elgin, a daughter.

14. At Kneller Hall, Whitton, the wife of C. Calvert, esq. M.P. for Southwark, a daughter.

17. In Devonshire, the lady of sir R. Lopez, bart. M.P. a son.

23. At Maidstone, the hon. lady Noel Hill, a daughter.

24. At Cleve Dale, near Bristol, the wife of col. Sealy, E.I.C. a son.

31. At Nottingham, near Weymouth, the wife of lieut.-col. Steward, a son.

— At the Royal Military Asylum, the wife of lieut.-col. Evatt, a daughter.

## NOVEMBER.

10. At Radway, Warwickshire, the wife of lieut.-col. F. S. Miller, C.B. a son;

23. At her father's, major-gen. sir T. Pritzler, K.C.B. Castle-lodge, Upnor, Kent, the wife of Edward Muller, esq. royal reg., a son.

30. At Babraham, Cambridgeshire, the wife of H. J. Adeane, esq. M.P. a daughter.

*Lately.* At St. Hilier, Jersey, the lady of — De Vuelle, esq. daughter of T. Tindal, esq. of Aylesbury, and niece to chief justice sir N. Tindal, of a boy and a girl.

## DECEMBER.

6. At Aldwick Lodge, Bognor, the wife of lieut.-col. Jenkins, E.I.C. a son.

9. At Brockley Hall, Somerset, Mrs. Smyth Pigott, a daughter.

17. In Portman-square, the countess of Chichester, a daughter.

18. At Harrington House, Whitehall, the countess of Harrington, (late Miss Foote), a son.

20. At Bryanston House, Dorset, the lady Emma Portman, a daughter.

21. At Brook Lodge, near Winton, the lady of major O'Donnaghue, a son.

28. At Wardour Castle, the hon. Mrs. Arundel, a son.

## MARRIAGES.

## JANUARY.

1. In the chapel of Warwick Castle, Joseph Neeld, esq. of Grosvenor-square, M.P. to lady C. Ashley Cooper, daughter of the earl of Shaftesbury.

— At St. Pancras New Church, capt. Litchfield, R.N. to Louisa, only daughter of the late H. C. Litchfield, esq.

3. At St. George's, Southwark, Chas. Kershaw, esq. of Stratford, Suffolk, to Mary, eldest daughter of the late Chas. Noble, esq. of Old Burlington-street.

4. At Mitcham, the rev. T. Lagden Ramsden, to Sophia Harriet, youngest daughter of the late lieut.-gen. sir H. Oakes, bart.

10. The rev. W. Pye, to M. Cripps, daughter of J. Cripps, esq. M.P. for Cirencester.

11. At Hendon, the rev. John James, to Elizabeth, daughter of W. Wilberforce, esq. of Highwood-hill, Middlesex.

18. At St. George's, Bloomsbury, Ashurst Majendie, esq. eldest son of L. Majendie, of Hedingham Castle, esq. to Frances, eldest daughter of John Griffin, esq. Bedford-place.

19. At Alexandria, in Egypt, W. N. Peach, esq. only son of N. W. Peach, esq. M.P. of Ketteringham Hall, Norfolk, to Hester Elizabeth, daughter of John Barker, esq. his majesty's consul-general for Egypt.

20. At Chelsea, John Newbery, esq. late lieut.-col. of the Sussex Militia, to Fanny, eldest daughter of lieut.-col. Le Blanc, of Chelsea College.

22. At Jersey, capt. Mark Evans, R.A. to Ann, relict of the late H. T. Rutherford, esq. of Redford-green, Selkirkshire.

## FEBRUARY.

1. At Milton, John G. Hutchinson Bourne, barrister, to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of J. R. Barrett, esq.



## MARRIAGES.

1. At Southover Lewes, the rev. Thomas Wheeler Gillham, to Harriet, only daughter of the late rev. James Hurdis, D.D. professor of poetry in the university of Oxford.

3. At Aspley Guise, Beds, John Marshall, esq. of Coldham-house, Cambridge-shire, to Anne Penelope, daughter of the late rev. Edward Orlebar Smith, of Aspley-house.

— At Uppingham, county Rutland, E. W. Wilmot, esq. fourth son of sir R. Wilmot, bart. to Augusta Matilda, only daughter of Charles Champion, esq. of Beaumont Chase.

5. At St. George's, Bloomsbury, T. Smith Barwell, esq. to Amelia, daughter of the late Henry Cline, esq. of Lincoln's-inn-fields.

8. At Brixton, the rev. Thomas Philpotts, only son of J. Philpotts, esq. M.P. to Mary Emma Penelope, only daughter of the late Ulysses Hughes, esq. of Grovesend, Glamorganshire.

— At Colton, Lancashire, J. I. Rawlinson, esq. barrister-at-law, to Mary, eldest daughter of the rev. J. Romney, of Whitestock-hall.

15. At Trinity Church, St. Mary-le-bone, the rev. Stair Douglas, only son of the late rear-admiral Stair Douglas, to Maria Edith, youngest daughter of Woodbine Parish, esq. commissioner of Excise.

17. In Devonshire, Alfred lord Harley, heir apparent to the earl of Oxford, to Eliza, daughter of the marquis of Westmeath, and grand-daughter the hon. Mrs. Cavendish Bradshaw.

— At Fareham, Hants, the rev. T. Wentworth Gage, to lady Mary Douglas, second daughter of the marquis of Queensbury.

22. The rev. H. Sneyd, of Stone, to Mary Ann, second daughter of Thomas Sneyd Kynnersley, esq. of Loxley Park, county Stafford.

24. At Ealing, Alex. Cobham Cobham, esq. of Shinfield House, Berks, to Jane Halse, second daughter of Richard Chambers, esq. Cradley Hall, county of Hereford.

## MARCH.

2. Mr. Wood, the vocalist, to Miss Paton, the divorced lady of lord W. Lennox.

5. J. M. Bosville Durrant, of the Priory, Southover, Sussex, esq. to Fanny, second daughter of J. Hubbard, of Stratford, Essex, esq.

8. At St. George's Hanover-square, the hon. W. Ashley Cooper, son of the earl of Shaftesbury, to Maria Anne, eldest daughter of col. Hugh Bailey, of Mortimer-street, Cavendish-square.

9. At East Down, the rev. O. H. Williams, youngest son of the late sir J. H. Williams, to Mary Anne Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the rev. Chas. Pyne Coffin.

14. At St. Mary's, Bryanstone-square, the rev. F. Cole, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late J. Ewing, esq. and sister to J. Ewing, esq. M.P.

15. At Titnes Park, the hon. W. Law, youngest brother of lord Ellenborough, to the hon. Augusta Graves.

16. At St. George's, Hanover-square, W. Hutt, esq. to Mary, countess of Strathmore.

17. At Belvoir Castle, the hon. Chas. Stuart Wortley, second son of lord Wharnccliffe, to the lady Emmeline Charlotte Elizabeth Manners, second daughter of the duke of Rutland.

19. At All-soul's Langham-place, the rev. George Sandby, jun. of Denton Lodge, Norfolk, to Elizabeth Catherine, second daughter of lieut-gen. Hodgson.

24. At St. George's, Bloomsbury, Marcus Martin, esq. barrister-at-law, to Harriett Mary, only child of the late John Stapleton, esq. of Calcutta.

26. At St. George's, Hanover-square, J. Cunninghame, esq. of Hensol, county Dumfries, N.B. to Eliza Mary Upton, daughter of the late capt. Clotworthy, Upton, R.N.

31. At St. Margaret's, Westminster, R. Willis, M.D. to Eleanor, third daughter of the late Mr. David Watson, of Whitehall.

## APRIL.

2. At Manchester, capt. W. D. Davies, of the Queen's Bays, to Susan Jane Forbes, only daughter of the late John Abernethie, esq.

5. At Trinity Church, St. Mary-le-bonne, F. J. Walthew, of Albany-street, Regent's-park, esq. to Elizabeth, third daughter of John Bent, esq. of Oat-hall, Lindfield, Sussex.

— At St. John's, Hampstead, the rev. Thomas Henley Causton, to the hon. F. Hester Powys, fifth daughter of the late lord Lilford.

7. At Elvaston Hall, near Derby, the right hon. Charles Stanhope, earl of Harrington, to Miss Foote, the celebrated actress.

12. At Iver, county Buckingham,



## MARRIAGES.

lieut-col. Bridger, C.B. to Jane, fourth daughter of John Copeland, esq.

12. At Richmond, capt. Henry Jelf, third son of sir James Jelf, to Miss C. A. Sharp, of Kincarrochy, co. Perth, daughter of the late major Sharp.

— At Twyford, F. P. Delme Radcliffe, esq. to Emma, only daughter of J. H. Waddington, esq. of Shawford-house.

— At St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, George Drummond, esq. of Stanmore, to Marianne, second daughter of the late E. B. Portman, esq. of Bryanston, Dorset.

— At the hon. Mrs. Burrowes's, Hill-street, Berkeley-square, baron de Cetto, minister plenipotentiary of the king of Bavaria, to Elizabeth Catherine, only daughter of the late col. Burrowes, of Dengen Castle, and grand-daughter to lord Decies, late archbishop of Tuam.

— At Exeter, W. Mackworth Praed, esq. barrister-at-law, eldest son of Mr. Serj. Praed, to Anne Frances, only daughter of Treby Hele Hays, esq. of Delamore, Devon.

16. At All-souls church, sir Richard Annesley O'Donel, bart. of Newport-House, Newport, co. Mayo, to Mary, third daughter of George Clendining, esq. of Westport, same county.

20. At Camberwell, Edward, eldest son of Charles Baldwin, esq. of Grove-hill, Camberwell, to Anne Calcott, youngest daughter of J. Horner, esq. also of Grove-hill.

27. In London, S. Clement, esq. to Louisa, daughter of the late W. Paley, esq. barrister-at-law, and grand-daughter of the late archdeacon Paley.

28. At St. George's, Bloomsbury, John Edridge, esq. of Pockeridge-house, Corsham, Wilts, to Mary Ann, eldest daughter of the late S. Yockney, esq. of Upper East Hayes, Bath.

— At Paris, the count de Montebello, to Mary Teresa, eldest daughter of T. Boddington, esq. of Cumberland-place.

— At Harpsden, Vincent Vaughan, esq. of Caversham Grove, to Mary-Ann, only child of the late J. Hussey, esq. of Pinkney House, Berks.

— At Poslingford, Suffolk, J. Raymond, esq. of Baythorn Park, to Mary Sophia, second daughter of col. Weston, of Shadowbush House.

— At Kingscote, Gloucestershire, J. Kennaway, esq. eldest son of the late sir J. Kennaway, of Escot, Devon, to Emily Frances, daughter of the late T. Kingscote, esq.

28. In France, Edward Turner, esq. eldest son of the hon. and rev. E. J. Turner, of Arundel, to Elizabeth, daughter of the late W. Crease, esq. of Dublin.

— At St. James's, the hon. R. Pepper Arden, of Pepper Hall, Yorkshire, to lady Arabella Vane, youngest daughter of the marquis of Cleveland.

## MAY.

2. Leonard Thompson, esq. eldest son of G. L. Thompson, esq. of Sheriff Hutton Park, Yorkshire, to Mary Wentworth Fitzwilliam, second daughter of lord Milton, and grand-daughter of earl Fitzwilliam.

— The rev. W. Gilson, to Eliza, third daughter of the bishop of Chester.

3. At Henley-on-Thames, R. King, esq. of Grosvenor-place, to Georgiana Ann, youngest daughter of the late hon. lieut-col. George Carleton, and sister of Lord Dorchester.

4. At All-souls Church, Langham-place, Francis Hawkins, M.D. of Curzon-street, Mayfair, to Hester, third daughter of the hon. Baron. Vaughan.

And, on the same day, Le Merchant Thomas, esq. only son of John Thomas, esq. of Brunswick-square, to Margaret, fourth daughter of the same.

5. His royal highness the grand Duke of Oldenburgh to her royal highness the princess Cecilia, sister of prince Gustavus Vasa.

10. At Watlingbury, Kent, major Maclean, 81st regiment, eldest son of lieut-gen. sir Fitzroy Maclean, bart. to Emily Eleanor, fourth daughter of the hon. and rev. Dr. Marsham.

12. At St. James's, the rev. C. G. Plumer, vicar of Norton, to Miss Thompson, of Stockton-upon-Tees.

— At Dublin, E. R. Borough, esq. eldest son of sir Richard Borough, bart. to lady Elizabeth St. Lawrance, sister of the earl of Howth.

16. At Kilkenny, R. Fowler, esq. son of the bishop of Ossory, to Harriet Eleanor Wandesford, daughter of the marquis of Ormond.

17. At St. George's, Hanover-square, the right hon. Robert Grosvenor, youngest son of earl Grosvenor, to the hon. Charlotte A. Wellesley, daughter of lord Cowley.

19. At Brompton, co. York, H. R. Beaumont, son of the late T. R. Beaumont, esq. of Bretton Hall, to Catherine, daughter of sir G. Cayley, bart.



## MARRIAGES.

19. At Carlsruhe, capt. Drummond (Melfort) to the baroness de Rothberg Coligny, of Rheinweiler, widow of gen. count Rapp.

— At Craigends, Renfrewshire, W. Bonar, esq. banker in Edinburgh, to Miss Lilliah Cunninghame, daughter of the late John Cunninghame, esq. of Craigends.

24. At Brighton, G. Boroughs, esq. R. Art. to Selina, eldest daughter of the late col. Childers, 11th Light Dragoons.

— At Paris, the count G. M. Possenti, of Rome, to Mary, daughter of the late col. Rogers, of Weston-super-Mare.

26. At St. George's, Hanover-square, F. C. Knowles, esq. eldest son of admiral sir C. Knowles, bart. to Emma, fourth daughter of sir G. Pocock, bart.

31. At Brinny, co. Cork, the hon. capt. W. Smyth Bernard, brother of the earl of Bandon, to Elizabeth, only daughter of lieut.-col. Gilman, late 81st Foot.

## JUNE.

2. At Cheltenham, Philip A. Brown, esq. to Caroline Jesscynthia, third daughter of sir Charles H. Rich, bart.

4. H. Beavan, esq. of Sackville-street, to Joanna, fourth daughter of T. Cadell, esq. of Upper Charlotte-street.

7. At Cheltenham, the rev. Thomas Gerard Leigh, to Henriana Matilda, daughter of the late lord Henry Murray, and niece to the duke of Athol.

9. At Prior Park, Bath, capt. Ellis, 4th Light Dragoons, eldest son of the late col. Ellis, to Eliza Georgiana, eldest daughter of col. J. L. Richardson, of the Bengal service.

14. At Paris, capt. A. Douglas, of the Madras establishment, to Emma Money, eldest daughter of the late hon. M. T. Harris.

15. At Stanford, major G. Birch, of Clare, co. Hants, to Lydia Diana, eldest daughter of the late rev. S. F. Dashwood, of Stanford-hall.

21. At Honiton, John Webber, esq. to Susan, fourth daughter of gen. Churchill.

23. At Newington, near Hythe, the rev. Kennett C. Bayley, second son of the hon. Mr. Baron Bayley, to Charlotte, eldest daughter of James Brookman, esq. of Beachborough, Kent.

— At Delganny, co. Wicklow, Wade Browne, esq. of Churchill, Worcester-shire, to Anne, eldest daughter of Mr. Serj. Pennefather.

27. At St. Mary's, Bryanstone-square,

the rev. Ralph Berners, youngest son of the ven. archdeacon Berners, to Eliza, third daughter of the late gen. sir C. Cuyler, bart.

28. At Bath, sir B. R. Graham, of Norton Conyers, bart. to Harriet, third daughter of the late rev. Robert Cottam.

## JULY.

7. At St. George's, Hanover-square, sir John Ogilvie, of Inverquharity, bart. to Juliana Barbara, youngest daughter of the late lord Henry Howard, and niece to the duke of Norfolk.

8. At St. George's, Hanover-square, T. Smith, esq. M.P. to Louisa, third daughter of sir M. W. Ridley, bart. M.P.

14. At Paris, baron de Robeck, to Emily Henry, niece to the Duke of Leinster.

— At St. George's, Hanover-square, Neill, eldest son of Neill Malcolm, esq. of Poltalloch, Argyllshire, to Harriett Mary, third daughter of the rev. sir Clarke Jervoise, of Idsworth-park, Hants, bart.

16. At St. Mary-le-bonne, Hugh Inglis, esq. to Rothes Beatrix, second daughter of the late sir John Leslie, bart.

21. At St. George's, Hanover-square, George Seymour, esq. son of lord G. Seymour, and minister resident at the court of Tuscany, to Gertrude Brand, daughter of the hon. gen. Trevor.

23. At Felbrigg-hall, viscount Ennismore, to Maria Augusta, widow of the late G. T. Wyndham, esq. of Cromerball, Norfolk, and daughter of admiral Wyndham.

31. G. B. J. Price, esq. of Pigeonsford, Cardiganshire, to Ellen, daughter of sir John Owen, bart. M.P.

*Lately.* At Brighton, Fred. Hodgson, esq. M.P. to Amelia Catherine, daughter of John Erskine, esq.

## AUGUST.

1. At Walston, the marquis of Hastings, to the hon. Barbara baroness Grey de Ruthyn, of Brandon-hall, Warwickshire.

2. Sir C. M. Lambert Monck, bart. to lady Mary Elizabeth Bennet, sister to the earl of Tankerville.

— At Cheltenham, C. H. Bell, esq. third son of the late Matthew Bell, esq. of Woolsington-house, Northumberland, to Helen, only child of sir B. W. Bur-



## MARRIAGES.

dett, bart. and grand-niece of the first marquis of Thomond.

4. At Willesdon, the hon. G. T. Kerpel, second son of the earl of Albemarle, to Susan, daughter of sir Coutts Trotter, bart.

9. At Bishop's Lydeard, capt. Hugh Fitz-Roy, grenadier guards, second son of the late lord Henry Fitz-Roy, to Lucy Sarah, second daughter of sir T. B. Lethbridge, bart.

13. At Milton, near Gravesend, sir G. Noel, bart. to Miss I. E. Raymond.

23. At Cirencester, Edward Bullock, esq. to Catherine, daughter of Joseph Cripps, esq. M.P.

— At Headington, Oxford, John Wilson, esq. capt. R.M. to Elizabeth, eldest daughter of sir Joseph Lock, of Oxford.

25. At Trinity Church, Mary-le-bone, Charles Tracy Leigh, esq. to Emma, youngest daughter of G. H. Dawkins Pennant, esq. of Penrhyn Castle, North Wales.

30. At Hanwell, Middlesex, William Johnson, esq. of Eaton-place, Belgrave-square, to Sarah, only daughter of C. Turner, esq. of Hanwell Park.

*Lately.* At Pinner, Middlesex, the rev. J. H. Bright, to Katherine Charlotte, daughter of the late col. Mant, and grand-daughter to sir George Dallas, bart.

## SEPTEMBER

5. At Bristol, K. H. Doolan, esq. second son of lieut-col. Doolan, to Mary, daughter of the late George Leigh, esq. of Pugley House, Devonshire.

7. At Lambeth, sir Ralph Abercrombie Anstruther, bart. of Balcaskie, to Mary Jane, eldest daughter of the late major-gen. sir H. Torrens.

10. At St. George's, Hanover-square, J. Barlow Hoy, esq. of Midanbury, Southampton, to Marian D'Oyley, only daughter and heiress of the late Sheardman Bird, esq. of Harold's Park, Essex.

13. At St. Margaret's, Westminster, J. Fairlie, esq. to Miss Home Purves, daughter-in-law to the right hon. the Speaker.

15. At St. George's Church, the rev. H. Wm. Buckley, grandson to John earl Delawarr, to Charlotte-Margaret, eldest daughter of the late sir John Lowther Johnstone, bart.

17. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Edward Godfrey, esq. to the right hon. Susan Elizabeth, countess dowager of Morton.

20. At St. George's, Hanover-square, the hon. Aug. Villiers, second son of the earl and countess of Jersey, to the hon. Miss Elphinstone, only daughter of viscountess Keith.

22. At St. George's, Hanover-square, G. F. Russell, esq. to Louisa Margaret, daughter of F. Hodgkinson, LL.D. viceprovost of Trinity College, Dublin.

27. At Quainton, Bucks, Richard Beamish, esq. of Sans Souci, Cork, to Theodosia Mary Heise, of Doddershall Park, eldest daughter of the late lieut-col. Aug. Heise.

30. At St. George's, Hanover-square, the rev. J. Jebb, eldest son of Mr. Justice Jebb, to Frances Emma, daughter of major-gen. Rich. Bourke.

— Mr. Serj. Goulburn, to the hon. Catherine Montagu, sister of lord Rokeby.

## OCTOBER.

1. Visc. Encombe, grandson to the earl of Eldon, to the hon. Louisa Duncombe, second daughter of lord Feversham.

4. At Churchtown, Lancashire, H. Hall Joy, esq. of Hartham Park, Wilts, to Mary Charlotte, only child of James Greenaigh, esq. Myerscough-hall, Lancashire.

5. At Weymouth, Philip Richardson, esq. to Georgiana, third daughter of the late J. Ford, of Finhaven Castle, Dorsetshire, esq.

— At Aldingbourne, Sussex, J. W. Buller, esq. of Downes, M.P. to Charlotte Juliana Jane, third daughter of the late lord Henry Howard, and niece to the duke of Norfolk.

6. At St. Mary's, R. North Collie Hamilton, esq. eldest son of sir Fred. Hamilton, bart. to Constance, daughter of gen. sir George Anson, M.P.

— At Southampton, Samuel Le Fevre, esq. to Anna Maria, second daughter of the hon. B. P. Le Blaquiere.

12. At Galway, J. Gunning Plunkett, esq. of Cloone, cousin to the duke of Argyle, to Jane, third daughter of the late F. Kelly, esq. of Liss-Kelly, and niece to the late John baron Clanmorris.

15. At Heighington, Durham, M. Falton, esq. a counsellor at the Irish bar, to Miss F. H. Kelly, the celebrated actress.

— At Loughton, Essex, gen. Grosvenor, to Anna, daughter of the late G. Wilbraham, of Delamere House, Cheshire, esq.

18. At Sandbach, Cheshire, the rev.



## MARRIAGES.

H. Spencer Markham, of Clifton rectory, Notts, to Sophia Charlotte, daughter of the late sir J. L. Kaye, bart. of Denby Grange, Yorkshire.

19. At Langton, sir John Pringle, bt. of Stichel-house, Roxburghshire, to lady Elizabeth Maitland Campbell, eldest daughter of the marquis of Breadalbane.

20. At All-souls, Mary-la-bone, Adam Ashew, of Redheugh, Durham, esq. to Elizabeth, sixth daughter of the late sir R. Rycroft, bart. of Everlands, Kent.

24. At St. George's, Hanover-square, the rev. Frederick Baring, son of Alexander Baring, esq., to Frederica Mary Catherine, third daughter of the late J. Ashton, esq. of the Grange, county Chester.

— At Denston, Suffolk, capt. Pigott, of the Royal Horse Guards, eldest son of sir G. Pigott, bart. to Georgiana Ann, youngest daughter of W. Brummell, esq. of Wivenhoe.

25. At Torquay, the hon. Charles Trefusis, brother of lord Clinton, to lady Elizabeth Georgiana Kerr, daughter of the late marquis of Lothian.

26. At Bath, Edward Horlock Mortimer, esq. of Studley, Wilts, to Jane, youngest daughter of the late col. Williams, and niece to the late gen. sir T. Picton.

27. At Shillinglee-park, Sussex, the seat of the earl of Winterton, W. Linton, esq. (the landscape painter) to Julia Adelina, only daughter of the rev. T. Swettenham, of Swettenham, and niece to the countess of Winterton.

29. At Liverpool, Henry Roscoe, esq. barrister-at-law, youngest son of the late Wm. Roscoe, esq. to Maria, second dau. of T. Fletcher, esq. of Liverpool.

*Lately.* At Clontarf, the rev. Walter Bishop Mant, eldest son of the bishop of Down and Connor, to Marianne, eldest daughter of the hon. Hans Blackwood, and niece to lord Dufferin.

## NOVEMBER.

1. At Ifly, near Oxford, rev. H. Salmon, rector of Swarvaton, Hants, to Emily Charlotte, daughter of the late vice-admiral Nowell.

5. At Clifton, in Gloucestershire, R. W. Elton, esq. E.I.C. sixteenth regiment N.I. nephew of the late admiral sir Wm. Young, to Ashley, eldest daughter of H. Evans Holder, esq. M.D. deceased.

15. At Ponteland, Northumberland, capt. Charles Ogle Streatfield, R. Eng.

to Kate Elizabeth, eldest daughter of the rev. J. S. Ogle, of Kirkley, prebend. of Durham.

20. At St. George's, Hanover-square, sir J. Montague Burgoyne, bart. Grenadier Foot Guards, of Sutton Park, Bedfordshire, to Mary Harriet, daughter of col. Gore Langton, M.P. of Newton Park, Somerset.

22. At St. George's, Hanover-square, Benjamin Travers, esq. of Bruton-street, Berkeley-square, to Mary Poulett, daughter of the late col. Stevens, of Discove House, Somersetshire.

23. At Margate, G. Gunning, esq. of Frindsbury, Kent, to Sarah Tournay, widow of the late sir T. Staines, K.C.B. of Dent de Lion.

*Lately.* The rev. Henry Dalton, curate of St. John's, Wolverhampton, to Sophia, daughter of lord Robert Fitzgerald, and first cousin to the duke of Leinster.

## DECEMBER.

1. At St. George's, Hanover-square, count Alex. Walwski, to lady Caroline Montagu, sister to the earl of Sandwich.

6. At Bowood, the seat of the marquis of Lansdowne, the right hon. lord Valletort, son of the earl of Mount Edgumbe, to Miss Fielding, daughter of capt. and lady Elizabeth Fielding.

8. W. Willis, esq. of Astrop-house, in the county of Northampton, to Sophia, daughter of W. R. Cartwright, esq. of Aynho, in the same county.

9. At Cheltenham, C. Kelson, esq. of the third Guards, to Anne, daughter of R. Holden, esq.

15. At Leamington, the rev. Charles Thomas Longley, D.D. head master of Harrow school, to Caroline Sophia, eldest daughter of sir H. Parnell, bart.

19. At Brighton, the hon. A. W. Pelham, M.P. eldest son of lord Yarborough, to the hon. Adelaide Maude, daughter of the visc. Hawarden.

— At Brocklesby, Lincolnshire, the hon. Charlotte Anderson Worsley Pelham, only daughter of lord Yarborough, to Joseph William, only son of sir J. Copley, bart. of Sprotborough, Yorkshire.

— Charles Shakerley, esq. of Park-place, Berks, to Jesse Matilda, daughter of James Scott, esq. of the Manor House, Shepperton.

21. At Chelsea, J. E. Walters, esq. of Lincoln's Inn, to Eleanor, daughter of A. R. Sidebottom, esq. of Lincoln's Inn.



## PROMOTIONS.

27. At Marylebone church, captain Forth, 75th reg., to Caroline, daughter of R. Sherson, esq. of Nottingham-place.

## PROMOTIONS.

## JANUARY.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

8. Brevet: lieut.-cols. hon. Lincoln Stanhope and W. Cross, to be colonels in the army.

15. *Royal Artillery*—Major-general Broke Young, to be col. commandant.

17. His majesty has declared himself col.-in-chief of the household brigade of Cavalry, consisting of the 1st and 2d Life Guards, and Royal Horse Guards.

*The Navy*—To be captains, John Wilson, G. B. Maxwell, hon. J. Cavendish, H. E. Napier.

To be commanders, Charles Blair, G. W. Matson, F. P. Blackwood, A. Milne, F. Hart, J. B. B. M'Hardy, lieut. J. Savage, (1816).

26. The duke of Sussex to be chief ranger and keeper of Hyde-park and St. James's-park.—The right hon. Robert Wilmot Horton to be governor of Ceylon.

31. The earl of Errol, and earl Howe, to be of the privy council.

## MEMBERS RETURNED IN PARLIAMENT.

*Bandon Bridge*.—Visc. Bernard.

*Beeralston*.—David Lyon, esq.

*Bletchingly*.—Charles Tennyson, esq.

*Dungannon*.—Lieut. col. John James Knox.

*Forfar and Perth*.—Right hon. Francis Jeffrey.

*Inverness Co.*—Right hon. C. Grant.

*Preston*.—Henry Hunt, esq.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

Lord Lyndhurst, to be chief baron of the Exchequer.

Sir James Shaw, elected chamberlain of the city of London.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

Rev. G. Davys, to be dean of Chester.

Rev. H. Philpotts, preb. in Durham cathedral.

## FEBRUARY.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

7. Visc. Duncannon, William Dacres Adams, and H. Dawkins, esqrs. to be commissioners of woods and forests.

15. Col. sir Arch. Christie to be deputy-governor of Stirling castle.—Major-gen. sir Benj. D'Urban, K.C.B. to be governor of Demerara.

23. Archibald John, earl of Roseberry, John William, visc. Duncannon, and the right hon. Michael Angelo Taylor, sworn of his majesty's privy council.—Thomas Robert Dimsdale, of Camfield-place, esq. to be sheriff of the county of Hertford.—Morgan Jones, of Kilwendeage, esq. sheriff of the county of Pembroke.—T. Duppa, of Llanshay, esq. to be sheriff of the county of Radnor.

24. To be knights Grand Crosses of the Bath, lieut.-gen. sir Wm. Houston, lieut.-gen. sir Edward Barnes, lieut.-gen. the right hon. sir John Byng.

25. To be grooms of his majesty's bed-chamber, vice-admiral the hon. sir H. Blackwood, bart. vice-admiral sir R. Otway, capt. the hon. G. P. Campbell, R.N. and col. sir J. Reynett.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Beaumaris*.—Sir R. B. Williams Bulkeley, bart.

*Bletchingly*.—Sir W. Horne, knt.

*Bossiney*.—Hon. J. Stewart Wortly.

*Helleston*.—Sir S. J. Brooke Pechell, bart.

*Wexford (Town)*.—Sir E. C. Dering, bart.

*Windsor*.—Right hon. E. G. S. Stanley.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

John Cowan, esq. to be alderman of Bread-street ward.

## MARCH.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

2. Knighted, col. Chas. Wade Thornton, aide-de-camp to his majesty.

8. 33d foot, lieut.-gen. sir Chas. Wale, K.C.B. to be col.—Unattached, major Robert Burdett, to be lieut.-col. of infantry.

9. Knighted, major-gen. James Campbell, K.C.H., William H. Poland, esq. and Chapman Marshall, esq. sheriffs of London and Middlesex.

11. The earl of Gosford, a lord of the bedchamber.



## PROMOTIONS.

14. Vice-admiral sir H. Digby, to be a K.C.B.—Captain sir Murray Maxwell, C.B. to be lieut-governor of Prince Edward's Island.

20. Knighted, maj.-gen. H. Wheatley.

21. Major-gen. sir Arch. Campbell, G.C.B. to be lieut-governor of New Brunswick and its dependencies.

23. To be gentlemen Ushers of his majesty's privy chamber, hon. Frederick Byng, Chas. Cavendish, esq., T. Shiffner, esq., W. Russell, esq.

— Knighted, capt. George Francis Seymour, R.N., major-gen. Benj. Chas. Stephenson, and J. Hall, esq. consul-general for Hanover.

— Marquis of Westmeath, to be a representative peer for Ireland.

24. Captain the hon. S. Hay to be one of her majesty's equerries.—Lieut-col. T. lord Grantham, and lieut-colonel E. Baker, to be his majesty's aides-de-camp for yeomanry cavalry.—Lieut-col. Fox, grenadier guards, to be one of his majesty's equerries.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Ashburton*.—W. S. Poyntz, esq.

*Durham*.—W. R. C. Chaytor, esq.

*Eye*.—William Burge, esq.

*Forfar, &c.*.—Hon. Wm. Ogilvy.

*Kilkenny Co.*.—Visc. Duncannon.

*Lancaster*.—P. Maxwell Stewart, esq.

*Milbourne Port*.—R. Lalor Shiel, esq.

— G. S. Byng, esq. (re-elected.)

*Nairn County*.—Hon. G. P. Campbell, (re-elected.)

*Newark-upon-Trent*.—W. F. Handley, esq.

*Peebles County*.—Sir G. Montgomery.

*Romney*.—Sir Roger Gresly, bart.

*Saltash*.—Philip Cecil Crampton, esq.

*Wigan*.—John Hodson Kearsley, esq.

*Whitechurch (Hants)*.—Hon. G. P. Townshend.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

Rev. D. Kyle, to be bishop of Cork and Ross.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

C. F. Williams, esq. to be recorder of Ipswich.

## APRIL.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

13. Knighted, George Harrison, esq.

15. Captain Pechell, R.N. to be one of the queen's equerries.—Adolphus Cottin, esq. to be gentleman usher quarterly waiter to her majesty.

22. 31st foot, gen. sir H. Warde, to be

col.—68th foot, lieut-gen. sir J. Keane, K.C.B. to be col.—94th, major-gen. sir J. Campbell, K.C.B. to be col.

Garrisons.—Gen. sir G. Don, G.C.B., to be governor of Scarborough castle.

Admiral sir W. Harwood, to be G.C. of the Guelph, and captains Usher and G. Seymour, K.G. of the same order.

Lieut. Stratford to be superintendant of the Nautical Almanack.

23. Right hon. R. Montgomery, lord Belhaven, to be high commissioner to the general assembly of the Church of Scotland.

Col. S. R. Chapman, C.B. to be governor and commander-in-chief of the Bermudas.

27. Major-gen. R. Bourke to be capt. gen. and governor-in-chief of New South Wales, and Van Diemen's Land.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Clare Co.*.—Maurice O'Connell, esq.

*Colchester*.—William Mayhew, esq.

*Launceston*.—Major-gen. sir J. Malcolm.

*Londonderry*.—Sir R. Ferguson, bart.

*Malton*.—Right hon. F. Jeffrey.

*Queen's Co.*.—Sir H. Parnell, bart.

*Shaftesbury*.—W. L. Maberley, esq.

*Winchelsea*.—S. Lushington, D.C.L.

## MAY.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

2. Lieut-gen. sir W. Houston, G.C.B. to be lieut-governor of Gibraltar.

12. Dr. W. M'Michael to be physician in ordinary.—Right hon. Laurence lord Dundas to be lieut. and sheriff principal of the shires of Orkney and Zetland.

Col. G. Fitzclarence to be baron Tewkesbury, visc. Fitzclarence, and earl of Munster.

13. Right hon. sir F. J. Lamb, G.C.B. to be ambassador extraordinary to the Emperor of Austria.

19. Admiral sir H. Trollope to be G.C.B.—Vice-admiral Edward Griffiths Colpoys, and vice-admiral E. J. Foote, to be K.C.B.

24. Col. Fred. Fitzclarence, captain Adolphus Fitzclarence, R.N., and rev. Augustus Fitzclarence, to have the title and precedence of the younger son of a marquis.—Sophia, wife of sir Philip Sidney; Mary, wife of lieut-col. the hon. C. R. Fox; and Augusta, widow of the hon. J. Kennedy Erskine, to have the title and precedence of the daughter of a marquis.

25. Knighted, William Beatty, esq.



## PROMOTIONS.

M.D. F.R.S., and W. Burnett, esq. M.D.

27. Earl Grey to be K.G.

28. Margaret, widow of Richard Talbot, esq. created a peeress of Ireland, by the title of baroness Talbot, of Malahide, and lady Malahide, of Malahide, county Dublin, with remainder to her male heirs by the said Richard Talbot.

31. The right hon. William George earl of Errol to be baron Kilmarnock, of Kilmarnock, county Ayr.

## JUNE.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

6. Lieut-gen. sir W. Hutchinson to be equerry to the duke of Sussex.—Admiral the hon. sir Robert Stopford, and admiral sir Benjamin Hallowell Carew, to be G.C.B.

7. Brevet—Lieut-gen. sir Edward Barnes, G.C.B. to have the rank of gen. in the East Indies only.

8. Vice-adm. Charles Ekins, and rear-adm. Thomas Baker to be K.C.B.

14. Adm. sir Thomas Foley, G.C.B. to be rear-adm. of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the navies and seas thereof.—John Henry Mandeville, esq. to be secretary to his majesty's embassy at the Sublime Porte.

15. Major-gen. W. Nicolay, to be governor of St. Christopher, Nevis, and the Virgin Islands.

16. Created peers of the united kingdom—Earl of Fingall, as baron Fingall, of Woolhampton-lodge, county Berks; earl of Sefton, as Baron Sefton, of Croxteth, county Lancaster; earl of Leitrim as baron Clements, of Kilmacrenan, county Donegal; lord Kinnaird as baron Rossie, of Rossie, county Perth; right hon. George James Welbore Agar Ellis as baron Dover, of Dover, county Kent.—Gen. W. Loftus to be lieutenant of the Tower.

22. Knighted—the right hon. Robert Wilmot Horton, governor of Ceylon.

The earls of Leven and Selkirk, and viscount Falkland, are elected representative peers of Scotland, in the room of the earl of Northesk deceased, the earl of Errol created a peer of Great Britain, and lord Sinclair who has retired.

## JULY.

14. Ralph Abercrombie, esq. to be secretary to his majesty's legation at Berlin.

21. The earl of Munster to be lieut. of the Tower.

25. Col. sir Evan Murray Macgregor to be governor of Dominica.—Lieut-col. A. W. Young to be lieut-governor of Prince Edward's Island.

26. Lieut-gen. sir F. T. Hammond, G.C.H. to be lieut-governor of Edinburgh castle.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Bletchingly*.—Visc. Palmerston, and T. H. Villiers, esq.

*Cashel*.—Philip Pusey, esq.

*Downton*.—Hon. D. P. Bouverie.

*Higham Ferrars*.—C. C. Pepys, esq.

*Malton*.—Wm. Cavendish, esq.

*Milbourne Port*.—P. C. Crampton, esq.

*Monmouth*.—Lord Worcester.

*Okehampton*.—Sir R. R. Vyvyan, bt.

*Newport (Cornwall)*.—Visc. Grims-ton.

*Reigate*.—Capt. C. P. Yorke.

*Tavistock*.—J. H. Hawkins, esq.

*Westbury*.—H. F. Stephenson, esq.

*Winchelsea*.—J. Brougham, esq.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

Rev. sir G. W. Bishopp, dean of Lis-more.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

Mr. Serj. Spankie to be standing counsel to the East India Company.

## AUGUST.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

2. Rt. hon. John Key, of Thornbury, Gloucestershire, and lord mayor of London, created a baronet.

3. Knighted—George Hamilton, esq. K.C.H.

8. Knighted—Lieut-col. the hon. Edward Cust, K.C.H.—Rear-adm. sir Jah-leel Brenton to be lieut-governor of Greenwich Hospital.

9. Brevet—Major H. Webster to be lieut-col. in the army.

10. Knighted—Lieut-gen. John Smith, R. Art. K.C.H. and John Rennie, esq. of Whitehall-place.

16. Lieut-gen. sir R. H. Vivian, bart. to be of the privy council in Ireland.

31. Knighted—Capt. J. Hill, R.N.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Bandon Bridye*.—Sir A. W. J. Clif-ford.

*Dublin*.—Frederick Shaw, esq., lord visc. Ingestrie.

*Grimsby*.—Lord Loughborough, the hon. Henry Fitzroy.



## PROMOTIONS.

*Meath (County).*—Hen. Grattan, esq.  
*Peebles (County).*—Sir John Hay, bt.  
*Roscommon (County).*—Dennis O'Connor, esq.

*Weymouth.*—Charles Baring Wall, esq.

## SEPTEMBER.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

7. To be peers of the united kingdom—Arch. earl of Cassilis, K.T. as marquis of the Isle of Ailsa, county Ayr; John earl of Breadalbane as earl of Ormelie and marquis of Breadalbane; Robert earl Grosvenor as marquis of Westminster; lord George A. II. Cavendish as baron Cavendish, of Keighley, county York, and earl of Burlington; Robert Dundas visc. Duncan as earl of Camperdown, of Lundie, county Forfar. and Gleneagles, county Perth; Thomas William visc. Anson, as earl of Lichfield, county Stafford.

To be an earl of Ireland—Thos. visc. Northland, as earl of Ranfurly, of Dungannon, county Tyrone.

To be barons of the united kingdom—Thomas marquis of Headfort, as baron Kenlis, of Kenlis, or Kells, co. Meath; John Chambre earl of Meath, K.P. as baron Chaworth, of Eton-hall, co. Hereford; George earl of Dunmore, as baron Dunmore, in the Forest of Athole, co. Perth; gen. George James earl Ludlow, G.C.B. as baron Ludlow; Robert Montgomerie lord Belhaven and Stenton, as baron Hamilton, of Wishaw, co. Lanark; gen. John Francis lord Howden, G.C.B. as baron Howden, of Howden and Grimston, county York; the hon. William Manle, as baron Panmure, of Brechin and Navar, county Forfar; the hon. George Cadogan, as baron Oakley, of Caversham, county Oxford; sir George Warwick Bamfylde, bart. as baron Poltimore, of Poltimore, county Devon; sir Rob. Lawley, bart. as baron Wenlock, of Wenlock, county Salop; sir Edw. Pryce Lloyd, bart. as baron Mostyn, of Mostyn, co. Flint; Wm. Fitzhardinge Berkeley, esq. as baron Segrave, of Berkeley Castle, county Gloucester; lieut-col. Arthur Chichester, as baron Templemore, of Templemore, county Donegall; William Lewis Hughes, esq. as baron Dinorben, of Kenmell-park, county Denbigh.

12. To be barons of the united kingdom—Valentine Browne, lord Cloncurry, as baron Cloncurry, of Cloncurry, county Kildare; adm. sir James Saumarez, vice-adm. of Great Britain, bart. and G.C.B.

as baron de Saumarez, of the island of Guernsey.

13. Gen. sir H. G. Grey, gen. sir R. C. Ferguson, gen. sir H. Warde, adm. sir T. Williams, adm. sir Wm. Hargood, lieut-gen. sir W. Lumley, lieut-gen. sir J. Willoughby Gordon, bart. and rear-adm. sir T. M. Hardy, bart. to be knights grand crosses of the order of the Bath.

Lieut-gen. Sam. V. Hinde, major-gen. John W. Guise, major-gen. Jas. Bathurst, major-gen. James S. Barns, rear-adm. sir R. Laurie, bart. major-gen. J. Macdonald, major-gen. Alex. Woodford, major-gen. Frederick C. Ponsonby, rear-adm. George Scott, rear-adm. Thomas Dundas, rear-adm. sir Graham Eden Hammond, bart., major-gens. sir John Buchan, sir Hugh Gouch, Chas. Ashworth, Chas. Bruce, John F. Fitzgerald, John Ross, Dugald L. Gilmour, Wm. Macbean, and sir George Elder, to be knights commanders of the order of the Bath.—Marquis of Queensberry to be a lord of the bedchamber.

13. Knighted—Lieut-col. Fred. Smith, commanding engineer of the London district, K.H.; lieut-col. Alex. Anderson, C.B., K.T.S.; Thomas Brancker, esq. mayor of Liverpool; Rob. Gill, esq. lieut. of the yeomen of the guard; Henry Cipriani, esq. senior exon of the same; Henry Hinrich, esq. lieut. of the gentlemen pensioners; Richard Burton, esq. senior member of the band of gentlemen pensioners; major-gen. Amos Goddill R. Norcott, C.B., K.C.H.; major Francis Bond Head, of Sutton, county Surry; Neil Douglas, esq. col. in the army, lieut-col. of 79th foot, aide-de-camp to his majesty, C.B., K.C.H.; William Howe Mulcaster, esq. post-captain R.N., C.B. K.T.S., and K.C.H.

15. To be baronets—Lieut-gen. John Slade, lieut-gen. sir William Anson, of Birch-hall, county Lancaster, K.C.B., lieut-gen. Kenneth Mackenzie of Glenbervie, county Kincardine; vice-adm. sir Robert Waller Otway, of Brighthelmstone, county Sussex, K.C.B.; major-gen. sir Arch. Campbell, G.C.B. and lieut-governor of New Brunswick; Augustus John Foster, of Stone-house, Lonth, esq. his majesty's minister to Sardinia; sir James M'Gregor, of Campden-hill, Middlesex, M.D. director-gen. of the army medical department; Robert Way Harty, of Prospect-house, Roebuck, county Dublin, esq. lord mayor of Dublin; col. John Thomas Jones, of Cranmer-hall, Norfolk; Robert Greenhill Russell, of Checquers-court, Bucks, esq.



## PROMOTIONS.

William Chaytor, of Croft, county York, and Witton-castle, Durham, esq.; Wm. Wrixon Becher, of Ballygiblin, county Cork, esq.; Joseph Birch, of the Hazles, county Lancaster, esq.; Robert Campbell, of Carrick Buoy, county Donegall, esq.; Wilfrid Lawson, of Brayton-house, county Cumberland, esq.; John Nugent Humble, of Cloncoskoran, county Waterford, esq.; James Martin Lloyd, of Lancing, county Sussex, esq.; James Gibson Craig, of Riccaiton, county Mid-Lothian, esq.; Joseph Barrington, of Limerick, esq.; Theodore Henry Lavington Broadhead, of Burton, or Monk Bretton, county York, esq.; John Colman Rashleigh, of Prideaux, co. Cornwall, esq.; J.—Campbell, of Balcardine, county Argyle, esq.; Percy Fitzgerald Nugent, of Donore, county Westmeath, esq.; John James Garbett Walsham, of Knill-court, county Hereford, esq. Wm. Heygate, of Southend, Essex, esq. alderman of London; Thos. M'Kenny, esq. alderman of Dublin; Henry Meux, of Theobalds-park, Herts, esq.; Charles Mansfield Clarke, of Dunham-lodge, Norfolk, M.D. physician in ordinary to his majesty.

16. Knighted, by patent, George Magrath, M.D. surgeon R.N.

21. Knighted—Col. Michael MacCreagh, K.C.H.; col. Robert Dick, aide-de camp to his majesty, C.B., K.M.T.; and John Soane, of Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, esq. architect.

26. To be companions of the Bath—Captains, Richard Curry, the hon. Fred. P. Irby, Dan. Woodriff, Jas. Sanders, the hon. George Elliot, Hugh Pigot, S. P. Humphreys, John Tower, William Hennah, William P. Cumby, the hon. Joceline Percy, And. King; Cols. Richard Payne, Charles Nicol, Henry King, Frederick Rennell Thackeray, J. B. Savage, J. F. Birch, Henry Phillott, Robert M'Cleverty, W. H. Knight Erskine, the hon. Lincoln Stanhope, John Grey, sir Henry Watson, knt., Chas. Ashe A'Court, C. W. Pasley, John Gillies, H. C. E. Vernon Graham, sir R. J. Harvey, Rob. Waller, Alex. Thomson, John Duffy, Jacob Tonson, William Alex. Gordon, lord George W. Russell, James Fergusson, Andrew Creagh, Robert Pym, Arch. Campbell; lieut.-cols. Richard Gubbins, T. H. Blair, Robert Lisle, Wm. G. Power, Wm. Balvaird, John Macdonald, Edw. Fanshawe, Wm. Cardon Seton, Elias Lawrence, Wm. C. E. Holloway, R. Eng., C. S. Campbell, George Turner, T. A. Brandreth, Patrick Campbell, Jas. Bogle,

John Michell, E. C. Whinyates; majors sir J. S. Lillie, kt., T. A. Parke, R.M., and H. R. Gore.

The following officers in the service of the East India Company, to be knights commanders of the Bath—Major-gens. Alex. Knox, John W. Adams, Henry Worsley, Hopetoun S. Scott, Rob. Scot, and Andrew M'Dowall.

The following officers in the same service to be companions of the Bath—Cols. John Rose, Gervase Pennington, James D. Greenhill, John Doyeton, F. H. Pierce, Robert Pitman, Hastings M. Kelly, John Mayne, W. C. Faithful; Lieut.-cols. Francis W. Wilson, Alex. Lindsay, Henry T. Roberts, James Caulfield, Richard Ticknell, Charles Fitzgerald, Sam. Hughes, Robert Smith; majors Alex. Manson, J. N. Jackson, and Arch. Irvine.

28. Knighted—Col. Richard Armstrong, lieut.-col. of 26th foot, C.B. and K.T.S., major-gen. Geo. Pownall Adams, K.C.H.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Armagh*.—Sir J. W. Head Brydges.

*Carmarthen*.—John Jones, esq.

*Dublin*.—Fred. Shaw, esq., lord visc. Ingestrie.

*Derby (County)*.—Lord Cavendish.

*Meath*.—Henry Grattan, esq.

*Ross*.—Wm. Wigram, esq.

*Sutherlandshire*.—Roderick M'Leod, esq.

*Wallingford*.—Thomas Chas. Leigh, esq.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

Right rev. Dr. R. J. Carr, bishop of Worcester.

Rev. Dr. E. Maltby, bishop of Chester.

Rev. Dr. Ponsonby, bishop of Derry.

Rev. Dr. J. Torrens, bishop of Killaloe.

Rev. R. Maude, archdeacon, of Dublin.

Rev. Dr. E. Goodenough, dean of Wells.

Bishop of Lichfield, prebendary of Westminster.

## OCTOBER.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

6. Lord Lilford to be a lord of his majesty's bedchamber, vice the earl of Waldegrave, resigned.

7. To be extra knights of St. Patrick—Arthur marquis of Downshire, Ulick-



## PROMOTIONS.

John marquis of Clanricarde, Francis William earl of Charlemont, and Francis James earl of Landaff.

12. Knighted—Chas. Bell, esq. F.R.S., K.H.; John Fred. Wm. Herschel, of Slough, Bucks, esq. M.A., F.R.S. and K.H.; Nicholas Harris Nicolas, esq. of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law, K.H. George Head, esq. deputy knight-marshal of his majesty's household.

16. Knighted—John Hollams, esq. mayor of Deal; Colonel Arch. Mac-laine, C.B., K.C.S.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Dorsetshire*.—Lord Ashley.

*Drogheda*.—T. Wallace, esq.

*Flint*.—H. Glynne, esq.

*Forfarshire*.—Hon. D. Ogilvie.

*Higham Ferrers*.—Hon. J. Brabazon.

*Louth (county)*.—Sir P. Bellew, bart.

*Malton*.—Cha. Chr. Pepys, esq.

*Pembrokeshire*.—Sir J. Owen.

*Poole*.—Sir J. Byng, bart.

*Wexford (County)*.—R. S. Carew, esq.

## ECCLESIASTICAL PREFERMENTS.

R. Whately, D.D. archbishop of Dublin.

Hon. and right rev. E. Knox, bishop of Killaloe.

Hon. and rev. R. Plunket, dean of Down.

Rev. T. Gaisford, dean of Christ Ch. Oxford.

Rev. Sam. Smith, D.D. prebendary of Durham.

Rev. Sydney Smith, prebendary of St. Paul's.

## NOVEMBER.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

2. Sir Alexander Duff Gordon, bart. to be gentleman usher daily waiter assistant to the king.

To form a Central Board of Health—the hon. Edw. R. Stewart, chairman; sir Wm. Pym, K.C.H., lieutenant-col. John Marshall, Dr. Russell, Dr. Barry, K.T.S., major R. Macdonald, and Wm. Maclean, secretary.

15. Ralph Bigland, esq. to be Garter principal king of arms, vice sir George

Naylor, deceased.—Wm. Woods, esq. to be Clarenceux king of arms, and principal herald of the south-east and west parts of England.—George Harrison Rogers Harrison, to be bluemantle pur-suivant of arms.

21. James Hudson, esq. to be resident gentleman usher to her majesty.

## MEMBERS RETURNED TO PARLIAMENT.

*Cambridge (County)*.—R. G. Town-ley, esq.

*Liverpool*.—Lord visc. Sandon.

*Tavistock*.—Lieut-col. F. Russell.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

Sir John Key, to be the second time lord mayor of London, having been three times elected by the liverymen.

Clinton James Fynes Clinton, esq. to be recorder of Newark.

Henry Cockburn, esq. solicitor-gen. for Scotland, to be lord rector of Glasgow university.

## DECEMBER.

## GAZETTE PROMOTIONS.

2. New bankruptcy court—The hon. Thomas Erskine to be chief judge; serj. Pell, serj. Cross, and George Rose, esq. to be the other judges; C. F. Williams, J. H. Merivale, Joshua Evans, J. S. M. Fonblanque, R. G. Cecil Fane, and Edw. Holroyd, esqrs. barristers-at-law, to be commissioners.

7. Knighted—Ralph Bigland, esq. Garter principal king of arms; Albert Pell, esq., John Cross, esq., and George Rose, esq., judges in bankruptcy.

The right hon. Thomas Erskine to be of his majesty's privy council.

20. Walter Aston Blount, esq. to be genealogist of the order of the Bath, and Blanc coursier herald.

26. George J. Bell, esq. advocate, to be one of the six ordinary clerks of session in Scotland.

## CIVIL PREFERMENTS.

Rev. E. Cardwell, to be principal of St. Alban Hall, Oxford.

Rev. J. Keeble, professor of poetry in the university of Oxford.



## PROMOTIONS.

## DEATHS.

1830.

*Sept. 2.* At his son's house, in St. James's-street, Bath, after long and patiently-endured suffering, from consumption, aged fifty-three, Mr. N. T. Carrington, author of "Dartmoor," "The Banks of Tamar," "My Native Village," and other poems. He was born at Plymouth in the year 1777. His parents were engaged in a retail grocery business, and, at one period of their lives, were possessed of considerable property. His father was also employed, in some capacity, in the Plymouth Arsenal. When he had attained his fifteenth year, his father proposed to apprentice him to Mr. Foot, then first assistant in the Plymouth Dock Yard. "A handsome sum of money," says Mr. Carrington, "was to have been paid down as the price of my admission into the Yard as Mr. Foot's apprentice. In consequence, however, of some difference, I was finally bound apprentice to Mr. Thos. Fox, a measurer. I was totally unfit, however, for the profession. Mild and meek by nature, fond of literary pursuits, and inordinately attached to reading, it is strange, that a mechanical profession should have been chosen for me. It was principally, however, my own fault. My father was attached to the Dock Yard, and wished to see me in it; and as the popular prejudice in those days among the boys of the town was in favour of the business of a shipwright, I was carried away by the prevailing mania, and was accordingly bound apprentice. This, however, had scarcely been done, when I repented; and too late found that I had embraced a calling foreign to my inclinations. Dissatisfaction followed, and the noise and bustle of a dock yard were but ill suited to a mind predisposed to reflection and the quietest and most gentle pursuits. The ruffianism of too many of the apprentices, and, indeed, of too many of the men, sickened me." This occupation in Plymouth Dock Yard grew every day more irksome to him, and, after remaining there about four years, he resolved on "running away," having in vain endeavoured to prevail on his parents to place him in a situation more consonant with his favourite pursuits. On leaving the Dock Yard, not

knowing whither to turn his steps, he, in a moment of bitter desperation, caused by the injustice with which he thought his parents had treated him, entered himself as a seaman on board a ship-of-war, and served in the action which took place off Cape Finisterre, Feb. 14, 1797. His first verses on record were written in commemoration of this event; they attracted the notice of his captain, who, perceiving that he deserved a better situation, and that some very untoward circumstances must have occurred to induce him to seek this line of life, gave him his liberty, and sent him home to his native town. He then commenced the business of a public teacher at Plymouth Dock (now Devonport), and speedily attracted considerable attention by his acuteness in his modes of instruction. He subsequently went to Maidstone, in Kent, where he opened a school. He remained in that town about three years; and it has been observed, that, in after life, he frequently dwelt with great delight on his recollections of the scenery around it. At the solicitations of a circle of friends at Plymouth Dock, who wished him to undertake the education of their sons, he returned in 1808 to that town, after a residence in Maidstone of about two years; and the academy which he then established he continued to conduct till within six months of his death. During nearly the whole of the above-named period, Mr. Carrington was employed in his laborious duties as a public teacher, from seven in the morning in summer till half-past seven in the evening; in the winter his labours commenced at nine in the morning and continued till eight at night. It was after this hour that he found his only opportunities for cultivating the taste for literature with which he had been gifted by nature. Although passionately fond of composition, he never suffered it to interfere in the slightest way with the more important duties of his station. The first edition of the "Banks of Tamar" appeared in 1820. He had, previously to the printing of that work, published many little fugitive poems of great beauty. He next published "Dartmoor, a descriptive poem," the first edition of which appeared in 1826. This poem was written for the purpose of being submitted, for the premium offered about two years before, for the best poem on that subject, by the Royal Society of Literature. By some accident, the premium was awarded three or four months



## DEATHS.—DEC. 1830.

before Mr. Carrington was aware that the time of presentation had arrived. It is needless to say, that his poem was not forwarded to the society: the author threw it by, without entertaining the slightest intention of ever publishing an effusion on what he imagined the bulk of the reading public would think a most unpromising subject. By some chance, however, the poem came under the notice of W. Burt, esq., secretary of the Plymouth Chamber of Commerce, who persuaded Mr. Carrington to publish it; and it accordingly appeared, with explanatory notes by that gentleman. "Dartmoor" met with far greater success than the author had ever dared to anticipate. It was received with much delight by the public, and a second edition was called for not more than two months after the appearance of the first.

Two or three years before the publication of "Dartmoor," the town of Devonport was seized with a mania for subscription schools; by the establishment of the first of these academies Mr. Carrington's prosperity, in common with that of several other public teachers residing in the town, was materially injured. He still, however, struggled on, though the circumstance of his having a large family dependent on his exertions rendered the decrease of income, caused by the subscription schools, to be very severely felt by him. Towards the close of 1827 he was attacked by incipient consumption, and in a few months it was apparent that the disease would inevitably be fatal. He still, however, attended unceasingly to his school, and although reduced to a mere skeleton, and weak as an infant, he continued to discharge his scholastic duties till March 1830—a period of nearly three years—when he became so completely worn out by the inroads of the deadly complaint with which he was afflicted, that he was obliged to cease from all further efforts. It was during his illness, and in a most enfeebled state of body, that Mr. Carrington wrote and prepared for the press his last publication—"My Native Village, and other Poems." From his grace the duke of Bedford, lord John Russell, lord Clifford, sir T. D. Acland, and other noblemen and gentlemen, Mr. Carrington received much kindness and attention; and his late majesty George IV. was a liberal patron of the poet. In July 1830, Mr. Carrington removed with his family to Bath, in order to reside with his son,

the then proprietor of the Bath Chronicle. By this time he was in the most advanced stage of consumption; he daily grew weaker and weaker, and on the evening of the 2nd of September he expired, apparently of mere weakness and exhaustion. As he always expressed the utmost horror of being buried in any of the "great charnel houses of Bath" (as he used to term the burial grounds of that populous city), he was interred at Combhay, a lonely and beautiful little village about four miles from Bath.

*Dec. 17.* Simon Bolivar expired at San Pedro, near Santa Martha, on Friday, the 17th of December. His excellency met the announcement of his fate with calmness and resignation—received the sacrament, and conformed to all the rites prescribed by his religion, and on the 11th of December performed the last act of his public life, by dictating and signing an address to the Colombian nation. He shortly afterwards became delirious, in which state, with occasional lucid intervals, he remained until one o'clock on the 17th, when he expired without a groan. All his expressions evinced the utmost anxiety for his country, and his horror of anarchy; and his most frequent exclamation was, "Union! union! or the hydra of discord will destroy us." On examination after death, the lungs were found to be slightly diseased, but the liver and other organs were not affected. The age of the Liberator was forty-seven years, four months, twenty-three days. He was born in the city of Caraccas, July 25, 1783; and his parentage was noble, both his parents having been "Mantuanas," which in the Caraccas is the distinctive title of rich families of birth. At the age of fourteen, he was sent to Spain; but although he devoted some time to jurisprudence, he paid more attention to the world than to study. From Spain he travelled into France, and resisted few of the temptations which surround a rich young man in the circles of Paris. "I have remarked," says general Holstein, his biographer, "that whenever he spoke to me of the Palais Royal, he could not restrain himself from extolling its delights." In the year 1802 he returned to Madrid, and married the daughter of Don Bernardo del Toro, uncle of the present marquis of that name. Bolivar was then but nineteen years of age, the lady but sixteen. In 1809 they returned to the Caraccas, and



## DEATHS.—JAN.

lived retired on their estates. The lady died shortly after, without leaving any offspring. General Bolivar, in his exterior, had nothing which would be noticed as imposing. He was five feet four inches in height; his visage long; his cheeks hollow; his complexion a livid brown. His eyes were of a middle size, and sunk deep in his head, which was covered thinly with hair; and his whole body was thin and meagre. He had the appearance of a man sixty-five years' old. In walking, his arms were in perpetual motion.

24. In Devonshire-place, aged 72, the rev. William Holwell Carr, B.D. F.R.S. vicar of Menhenniot, Cornwall. This gentleman's paternal name was Holwell. He was of Exeter College, Oxford, M.A. 1784, B.D. 1790, and was presented to the vicarage of Menhenniot, one of the most valuable benefices in Cornwall, by the dean and chapter of Exeter. Mr. Carr was for many years one of the most distinguished patrons, as well as an exquisite connoisseur, of the fine arts, and was a director of the British Institution. His own pictures consisted principally of productions of the Italian school; one of which is Leonardo da Vinci's Christ disputing with the Doctors, bought of lord Northwick, in 1824, it is said for 2,600*l*. This valuable collection Mr. Carr has bequeathed to the nation—on this stipulation, however, that a gallery should be provided where they may be properly seen and justly appreciated.

1831.

## JANUARY.

1. At Calais, in his 92nd year, the hon. Philip Roper, uncle to lord Teynham.

— At St. Leonard's, near Hastings, by a fall from his horse, in returning from hunting, aged 17, George James, only son of Thomas Wood, esq. of the Regent's Park, and grandson of James Burton, esq. of St. Leonard's.

— Aged 69, Mr. Charles Heath, printer, Monmouth, where he twice served the office of mayor. He was the author of a "Descriptive Account of Piercefield and Chepstow," 1793; a "History of Monmouth," 1804; and "Accounts of Tintern Abbey, and Ragland Castle," 1806.

2. In Grosvenor-sq., the most hon. Henrietta-Maria marchioness of Ailes-

bury. She was the eldest daughter of Noel first and late lord Berwick; was married April 10th, 1793, and has left two sons and four daughters.

2. At Northampton, aged 66, the rev. Benjamin Lloyd Edwards, upwards of 45 years Minister of the Independent Congregation assembling at King's Head Lane Chapel in that town.

— At Bonn, aged 53, M. Niebuhr, the eminent Roman historian. He was a son of Carsten Niebuhr, the oriental traveller, an excellent biography of whom he prefixed to the first volume of his historical and philological works. The first portion of his history of Rome was published at Berlin in 1812. The work was intended to be continued to the point where Gibbon commences. In 1816 M. Niebuhr, then a professor at Berlin, was appointed by the king of Prussia, his minister at Rome. It appears that this legation was created less from political motives than from personal patronage towards M. Niebuhr. His Prussian majesty was anxious to place the historian where he could enjoy advantages and facilities in pursuing his inquiries which he could not have had in any other manner. However, he concluded a sort of Concordat with the Holy See in the year 1821. On his return, the professorship of history was founded for him in the university of Berlin; and he was attached as a supernumerary, under the name of a Free Associate, to the University of Bonn. He was also adorned with several orders and decorations, and continued a counsellor of state until his death. The widow of M. Niebuhr did not survive him many days.

— Lieut.-general sir Gabriel Martindell, K.C.B., commanding the garrison at Buxar, in the East Indies.

4. At Clifton, aged 90, lieutenant-general, Richard Bright, late of the Royal Marines, and many years Commandant of the Plymouth Division.

— At Thirkelby, near Thirsk, aged 80, sir Thomas Frankland, the sixth baronet of that place, M.A. F.R.S. F.L.S. and F.H.S.

5. At Aberdeen, aged 86, Deacon Alexander Watson, tailor; the author of that popular national song, "The Kail Brose of Auld Scotland;" and other similar effusions.

— Aged 71, lieut.-general Robert Lethbridge, brother to the late Chancellor Lethbridge, esq. of Launceston.

6. At Goodwood, aged 8, Lady Sarah



## DEATHS.—JAN.

Lennox, 2nd daughter of the duke of Richmond and Lennox, K.G.

7. At the Castle Priory, Wallingford, aged 66, James Blackstone, esq. D.C.L. Principal of New Inn Hall, and Deputy Steward of the University of Oxford. He was a son of the celebrated Judge, and graduated B.C.L., 1787. D.C.L. 1792. In 1793 he was appointed Vinerian Professor of Common Law; and in 1803 Principal of New Inn Hall. Dr. Blackstone resigned the Professorship in 1824.

— Henry Hatsell esq. of Spring Garden Terrace, London, aged 41.

8. At Swinnerton-hall, aged 59, Mary, daughter of the hon. James Dormer, younger son of John, 7th lord Dormer.

— On his estate, near Theodosia, in the Crimea, aged 67, Semen Bronevsky, author of a "Geographical and Historical account of the Caucasus," two vols. 1823.

9. In Stratford-place, aged 60, the right hon. Charlotte Fitzgerald de Roos. baroness de Roos. Her ladyship was the only surviving child and heiress of capt. the hon. Robert Boyle Walsingham (fifth and youngest son of Henry 1st earl of Shannon), by Charlotte, daughter of sir Charles Hanbury Williams, K.B. She was married Aug. 4, 1791, to lord Henry Fitzgerald, uncle to the present duke of Leinster. The ancient barony of de Roos had been in abeyance for 119 years, when it was allowed to this lady in 1806. Having petitioned the king to terminate the abeyance in her favour, the petition was, on the report of the attorney general, referred to the House of Lords; who, on the 7th of May, 1806, reported that the barony was then in abeyance between 1. sir Henry Hunloke, bart. (heir general of Bridget Manners, eldest daughter and coheir of George 7th earl of Rutland); 2. George earl of Essex (as son and heir of Frances, elder daughter and coheir of sir C.H. Williams); and 3. the petitioner. Two days after the date of this report, the king was pleased to terminate the abeyance in her ladyship's favour.

10. At the Palace, Cork, aged 55, the hon. and right rev. Thomas St. Lawrence, D.D. lord bishop of Cork and Ross; uncle to the earl of Howth and the viscountess Dungarvon, and father-in-law to the bishop of Elphin.

12. Aged 81, her royal highness Louisa landgravine of Schleswig and Holstein: aunt and mother-in-law to the king of Denmark, and first cousin to his late majesty George the third, king of Great Britain. She was born Jan. 30,

1750, was a daughter of Frederick the fifth, king of Denmark, and Louisa of Great Britain, the fifth daughter and youngest child of king George the second. She was married Aug. 30, 1766, to the landgrave Charles of Hesse Cassel, field marshal in the Danish army, and governor of the duchies of Schleswig and Holstein; by whom she had issue: 1. Maria-Sophia-Frederica, born in 1767 and married in 1790 to Frederick the sixth, king of Denmark: 2. Prince Frederick, general of infantry in the Danish service, and governor of Rendsborg; 3. Julia-Louisa-Amelia, abbess of Itzehoe; and 4. Louisa-Caroline, married in 1810 to Frederick duke of Holstein-Beck.

— Aged 80, George Whitelocke, esq. of Melbury-terrace, Dorset-sq. He was son of major John Carleton Whitelocke, of Priors Wood, near Dublin, and grandson of Carleton Whitelocke, esq. of London and Surrey, counsellor-at-law, the sixth son of sir Bulstrode Whitelocke, of Fawley-court, co. Bucks, keeper of the great seal of England, and by the protector styled lord Whitelocke.

14. In Portland-place, aged 30, sir Charles Joshua Smith, the second baronet, of Suttons in Essex.

— At Edinburgh, aged 85, Henry Mackenzie, esq. author of "The Man of Feeling." He was the son of Dr. Joshua Mackenzie; and after receiving a liberal education, devoted himself to the law, and in 1766. became an attorney in the Court of Exchequer at Edinburgh. Ultimately his practice in that court produced him about 800*l.* a year; he became comptroller-general of taxes for Scotland with a salary of 600*l.* a year, and altogether his annual income was upwards of 2,000*l.* He married in 1767 Miss Pennel Grant, daughter of sir James Grant, of Grant, by whom he had a family of eleven children. When very young Mr. Mackenzie was the author of numerous little pieces in verse; and, though of a kind and gentle temper, the credit which he enjoyed for wit induced him occasionally to attempt the satiric strain. He next aspired to the sentimental and pathetic novel; and in 1768 or 1769, in his hours of relaxation from professional employment, he wrote, what has generally been considered his masterpiece, "The Man of Feeling." At first the booksellers declined its publication, but difficulties were at length surmounted—the book appeared anonymously—and the warmest enthusiasm was excited in its



## DEATHS.—JAN.

favour. Mr. Eccles, a young Irish clergyman, was desirous of appropriating the fame to himself. He accordingly was at the pains of transcribing the entire work, and of marking the manuscript with erasures and interlineations, to give it the air of that copy in which the author had wrought the last polish on his piece before sending it to the press. Of course this gross attempt at deception was not long successful. "The Man of Feeling" was published in 1771; and its success induced the author, in the same or following year, to publish a poem entitled "The Pursuit of Happiness." Mr. Mackenzie's next production was "The Man of the World;" a sort of second part of "The Man of Feeling, but, like most second parts, inferior to its predecessor. "Julia de Roubigne," a novel, in the epistolary form, was the last work of this class from the pen of Mr. Mackenzie. In 1773 Mr. Mackenzie produced a tragedy under the title of "The Prince of Tunis," which was performed with applause for six nights at the Edinburgh Theatre. His next dramatic piece was "The Shipwreck, or Fatal Curiosity." This was an alteration and amplification of Lillo's tragedy of "Fatal Curiosity," suggested by a perusal of Mr. Harris's *Philological Essays*, then recently published. Mr. Colman had about the same time taken a fancy to alter Lillo's play. His production was brought out at the Haymarket, in 1782; and Mr. Mackenzie's at Covent Garden, in 1783 or 1784. The "Force of Fashion," a comedy, by Mr. Mackenzie, was acted one night at Covent Garden Theatre, in 1789; but, from its failure it was never printed. The "White Hypocrite," another unsuccessful comedy by Mr. Mackenzie, was produced at Covent Garden in the season of 1788-9. Some years afterwards he and a few of his friends, mostly lawyers, who used to meet occasionally at a tavern kept by M. Bayll, a Frenchman, projected the publication of a series of papers on morals, manners, taste, and literature, similar to those of the "Spectator." The society, originally designated the Tabernacle, but afterwards the Mirror Club, consisted of Mr. Mackenzie, Mr. Craig, Mr. Cullen, Mr. Bannatyne, Mr. Macleod, Mr. Abercrombie, Mr. Solicitor-general Blair, Mr. George Home, and Mr. George Ogilvie; several of whom afterwards became judges in the supreme courts of Scotland. Their scheme was speedily carried into effect; and the papers, under the title of the "Mirror,"

of which Mr. Mackenzie was the editor, were published in weekly numbers, at the price of three-pence per folio sheet. The sale never reached beyond three or four hundred in single papers, but the succession of the numbers were no sooner closed, than the whole, with the names of the respective authors, were republished in three duodecimo volumes. The writers sold the copy-right, out of the produce of which they presented a donation of 100*l.* to the Orphan Hospital, and purchased a hogshead of claret for the use of the Club. To the "Mirror" succeeded the "Lounger," a periodical of a similar character, and equally successful. Mr. Mackenzie was the chief and most valuable contributor to each of these works. On the institution of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Mr. Mackenzie became one of its members; and amongst the papers with which he enriched the volumes of its transactions, are an elegant tribute to the memory of his friend Judge Abercrombie, and a memoir on German Tragedy. For this memoir he had procured the materials through the medium of a French work; but desiring afterwards to enjoy the native beauties of German poetry, he took lessons in German from Dr. Okely, who was at that time studying medicine in Edinburgh. The fruits of his attention to German literature appeared further in the year 1791, in a small volume of translations of two or three dramatic pieces. In 1793 Mr. Mackenzie edited a quarto volume of "Poems by the late rev. Dr. Thomas Blacklock, together with an Essay on the Education of the Blind," &c. In political literature he was the author of a review of the proceedings of the parliament which met first in the year 1784, and of a series of letters under the signature of Brutus. In all those exertions which, during the war of the French revolution, were found necessary to support the government and preserve the peace of the country, no person was more honourably or more usefully zealous. Mr. Mackenzie was remarkably fond of rural diversions, of fowling, hunting, and fishing. In private life his conversation was ever the charm and the pride of society.

— Capt. Bridges, of Chessington, near Kingston. He joined the hunt at Riddlesdown, on a sudden pulled up his horse, and expired on his arrival at a public-house near at hand. He was the individual who performed a feat many years ago of riding full gallop down the



## DEATHS.—JAN.

Devil's Dyke, near Brighton, for a bet of 500*l*.

15. At Upton Hall, near Northampton, Thomas Samwell Watson Samwell, esq. for upwards of forty years one of his majesty's acting justices of the peace for the county, a deputy-lieut., and verdurer of Whittlebury forest.

17. John Bristow, esq. of Beddington. When following Mr. Jolliffe's hounds, he was observed to drop forward, and ultimately fell from the saddle quite dead.

— At Foxcote, Francis Canning, esq. the head of the family from which sprung lord Garvagh, and the late Mr. Canning.

— At Malta, the right hon. Elizabeth Jemima, countess dowager of Errol, wife of the right hon. John Hookham Frere, of Roydon, Norfolk; she was the second daughter of Joseph Blake, esq. grandfather of the present lord Wallscourt, by Honoria, daughter of Dermot Daly, esq.; was first married Jan. 25, 1790, to George 16th earl of Errol, who died without issue June 14, 1798; and secondly to Mr. Frere, Sept. 12, 1816.

17. In Berkeley-square, Ellen, wife of Thomas Legh, esq. M.P. of Lyme Hall, Cheshire—late Miss Turner, for the abduction of whom the Wakefields were tried and imprisoned.

19. At Edinburgh, Nath. Gow, the well-known Scottish violinist and composer of many popular airs.

— At Malableshtar Hills, his excellency lieut.-gen. sir Thomas Sydney Beckwith, knt. K.C.B., K.T.S., commander of the forces at the presidency of Bombay.

20. At his seat, Frognal, Kent, aged 66, the right hon. John Thomas Townshend, second viscount Sydney of St. Leonard's in Gloucestershire, and baron Sydney of Chislehurst, in Kent, ranger of St. James's and Hyde Parks, high steward of Yarmouth, M.A. and F.S.A., brother-in-law to the earl of Chatham, K.G., the earl of Leitrim, lord de Clifford, and lord Dynevor, and uncle to the duke of Buccleugh and Queensberry, K.G., and viscountess Stopford. His lordship, born Feb. 21, 1764, was the eldest son of Thomas, first viscount Sydney, secretary of state, by Elizabeth, eldest daughter and coheiress of Richard Powys of Hintlesham in Suffolk, esq. He was of Clare Hall, Cambridge, where the degree of M.A. was conferred on him in 1784. In 1789 he was appointed one of the lords commissioners of the Admiralty; and, at the general elections in 1790 and 1796, he was returned for

Whitchurch. In June, 1793, he was transferred from the Admiralty Board to that of the Treasury, where he sat until, having succeeded his father in the peerage, June 13, 1800, he was in July that year, appointed a lord of the bed-chamber. He resigned that post in 1812. His lordship was twice married: firstly, April 12, 1790, to the hon. Sophia Southwell, third daughter of Edward lord de Clifford, and by that lady had two daughters—the hon. Sophia Mary Townshend, and the hon. Mary Elizabeth, married in 1825 to George James Cholmondeley, of Boxley House, in Kent, esq. These ladies are presumptive coheiresses to the barony of de Clifford. Having lost his first lady Nov. 9, 1795, lord Sydney married, secondly, May 27, 1802, lady Caroline Clements, third daughter of Robert, first earl of Leitrim, who died Aug. 9, 1805, in giving birth to her first child, the right hon. John Robert, now third viscount Sydney.

23. Drowned in the Serpentine river, aged 53, the right hon. Horace William Pitt, third baron Rivers, of Sudeley Castle, in Gloucestershire. He was the only son of Peter Beckford, of Stapleton, in Dorsetshire, esq. by the hon. Louisa Pitt, second daughter of the first lord Rivers. As Mr. Horace Beckford, he was for many years a distinguished member of the *haut ton*; and it was only after his succeeding to the title on the death of his maternal uncle, July 20, 1828, that he took the name of Pitt.

24. At Pembroke, in her 80th year, Corbetta, widow of Joseph Lord, esq., daughter of the late gen. John Owen, of Orierton, and mother of sir John Owen, bart. M.P. and lord lieutenant of the county of Pembroke.

26. At his house in Portland-place, aged 85, Richard Paul Jodrell, esq. D.C.L., F.R.S. and S.A. deputy lieutenant and justice of the peace for the counties of Oxford, Derby, Norfolk, and Middlesex; father of sir Richard Paul Jodrell, bart. Mr. Jodrell was born Nov. 13, 1745. He was educated at Eton, and at Hertford College, Oxford; and his attachment to his classical studies was evinced by his compositions in the "*Musæ Etonenses*," and by subsequent more laborious publications. To the supplementary notes of Potter's *Æschylus*, printed in 1778, he was a contributor; in 1781 he published, in two vols. 8vo, "*Illustrations of Euripides, on the Ion and Bacchæ*;" and in 1790,



## DEATHS.—JAN.

another volume—"On the Alcestis." "A Widow and no Widow, a dramatic piece in three acts," by him, was acted at the Haymarket in 1779, and printed in 1780, 8vo. At the same theatre, in 1783, was performed with success his "Seeing is Believing," in one act, printed in 1786. His tragedy, called "The Persian Heroine," having been rejected by the managers of the two great theatres, was printed in 1786, 8vo. and 4to. In the following year he published "Select Dramatic Pieces; some of which have been acted on provincial theatres, others have been written for private performance and country amusement;" and consisting of, "Who's Afraid? a farce;" "the Boarding School Miss, a comedy;" "One and All, a farce;" "the Disguise, a comedy;" "the Musico, a farce;" and "the Bulse, a dramatic piece." He also published, in 4to. 1785, "the Knight and Friars," an historic tale, from Heywood's *Рыцарей*; the work of three mornings in the Christmas holidays.

In 1784 Mr. Jodrell became a member of a club founded at the Essex Head, for the purpose of cheering the declining days of Dr. Johnson, and, it is believed that he and the late Mr. Chamberlain Clark, who died a few days before him, were the last survivors of that celebrated literary fraternity. Mr. Jodrell was elected a fellow of the Royal Society in 1772, and of the Society of Antiquaries in 1784. He was created D.C.L. at Oxford, July 4, 1793. At the general election 1790, Mr. Jodrell was returned one of the barons in parliament for Seaford; but by the decision of a committee, he was declared not duly elected on the 19th of March, 1792. However, when Mr. Sargent was made clerk of the ordnance, in Jan. 1794, he was re-elected for the same place; but after the dissolution in 1796 he did not again sit in the House. With advancing years, the mind of Mr. Jodrell had become obscured, and from the year 1822 he gradually sunk into such absolute incapacity, that it became necessary to make him the subject of a commission of lunacy.

— At St. Petersburg, baron Delvig, editor of the '*Sævernietzveti*,' or Northern Flowers, by far the best of the Russian Annuals; and also of a periodical entitled the "Literary Gazette."

28. At St. Petersburg, aged 50, Alexander Ephimovitch Izmailov, editor of the journal entitled the "Blagonamærenie." Although by no means equal to

those of Krilov and Khemnitzer, his fables and tales acquired for him, not undeservedly, a considerable degree of reputation, and have passed through several editions.

30. In Burton-crescent, aged 66, sir John Perring, bart., alderman of London, a commissioner for issuing Exchequer bills, and F.S.A. Sir John was the eldest son of Philip Perring, of Membland, co. Devon, esq. by his wife Susanna, daughter and eventually heiress of Richard Legassick, esq. He was elected alderman for Broad-street Ward in 1798; served the office of sheriff of London in 1800, and was elected lord mayor in 1803. At the general election in 1806 he was returned to Parliament for Romney; and, having lost his seat at the dissolution in 1807, he was a few years after elected for Hythe, which place he represented in three parliaments until 1820. He was raised to the dignity of a baronet by patent dated Oct. 3, 1808. Sir John was for many years an eminent merchant and banker in the city of London. Shortly after the panic in 1825, the banking house, in which he was a partner, suspended its payments; and the demands of the creditors could not be satisfied without the sacrifice of sir John's estates.

— At Canterbury, aged 76, John Baker, esq., for many years one of the representatives of that city in Parliament. This gentleman was a native of Canterbury; his father, George Baker, esq. who was a respectable practitioner of medicine and surgery there, left him a considerable fortune; which he himself increased by marriage with Jane, eldest daughter of the rev. James Tattersall, rector of St. Paul's, Covent-garden. Mr. Baker resided for a considerable time at Hawkhurst-lodge, in the Weald of Kent, a house built by his uncle, John Baker, esq., who was receiver-general for the county. Whilst resident there, he became one of the greatest hop-planters in that district; he removed to St. Stephen's, near Canterbury, on establishing the Union Bank there. In 1796 Mr. Baker became a candidate to represent his native city in parliament. He started on what was called the independent interest, together with John Sawbridge, esq., son of the alderman of that name. On this occasion Mr. Baker stood at the head of the poll; but the election was declared void, on the ground of treating. At the election which took place soon after,



## DEATHS.—FEB.

they again had a majority of votes, but another committee of the House declared sir John Honeywood and Mr. Gipps to be the sitting members. In 1802 Mr. Baker once more became a candidate, and was returned in conjunction with the late hon. George Watson, uncle to the present lord Sondes, without opposition. He was again returned at the general elections of 1806, 1807, and 1812, and retired at that of 1818. In politics he was a Whig.

31. At Hinckley, Robert Chessher, esq. who, for upwards of forty years, distinguished himself in every branch of the medical profession, but particularly in the successful treatment of deformities of the human frame. The great number of wealthy patients committed to his care contributed greatly to the welfare of the town and neighbourhood.

— At Hough, Cheshire, aged 85, the rev. Robert Hill, rector of Great Bolas, Salop, and perpetual curate of Talk-o'-th' Hill, Staffordshire, for many years a magistrate for Cheshire, uncle to general lord Hill, and younger brother to the celebrated rev. Rowland Hill.

— At Berkhamstead Castle, Herts, aged 53, the hon. Charlotte Grimston, sister to the earl of Verulam. This lady was the compiler of some family history, a few years ago privately printed in lithography.

— At Greenwich, Charles Derrick, esq. for many years secretary to the committee of Stores, at the Navy-office. He was the author of "Memoirs of the rise and progress of the Royal Navy," published in 4to, 1816, some collections in continuation of which he communicated to the Gentleman's Magazine in 1828 and 1829.

## FEBRUARY.

2. In King-street, St. James's-square, after a long illness, aged 58, James Christie, esq. Mr. Christie was the eldest son of an eminent auctioneer of that name. He was educated at Eton, and was originally intended for the church. His first production in 1802, was an Essay on the ancient Greek Game, supposed to have been invented by Palamedes antecedent to the siege of Troy. It was an attempt to prove that the game of Palamedes was known to the Chinese, and was progressively improved by them into the Chinese, Indian, Persian, and European chess. An intimacy with the

late Charles Towneley, esq. directed the attention of Mr. Christie to the use and meaning of those painted vases usually termed Etruscan; and in 1806 he published a volume, entitled "A Disquisition upon Etruscan vases." A limited number of copies having been printed, the work soon became scarce, and in 1825, Mr. Christie published a new and enlarged edition, adding an appendix, in which some most ingenious reasoning is employed to refer the shape and colour of Greek vases to the water lily of Egypt, and a classification is given formed upon this basis. The description of the Lanti vase, in the possession of the duke of Bedford, was written by Mr. Christie, and is printed in the volume which illustrates his grace's collection of marbles. The catalogue of Mr. Hope's vases is also from the same hand. A third publication from the pen of Mr. Christie is an Essay on the earliest species of idolatry, the worship of the elements; the purport of which is, to shew for what purpose the elements were referred to by early nations; what was understood of the Deity by their means, and by what misconception they became objects of worship. It is not surprising that such a man raised his business of an auctioneer to the dignity of a profession. In pictures, in sculpture, in vertû, his taste was undisputed, and his judgment deferred to. Mr. Christie was a member of the Dilettante Society. He was for some years one of the registrars of the Literary-fund; and was also a member of the Antiquarian Society of Newcastle.

3. At Skreens, near Chelmsford, Thomas Gardiner Bramston, esq. late M.P. for Essex. He was the eldest son of T. Berney Bramston, esq. who sat in parliament for that county from 1779 to 1802.

— At Hudsutt, Christiana Philippa Maria, youngest sister to lord Rolle.

— At Bath, aged 84, the rev. William Trail, LL.D., chancellor of the cathedral of Connor, F.R.S. Ed. and M.R.I.A. He was a son of the right rev. James Trail, bishop of Down and Connor from 1765 to 1783. He was for some time professor of mathematics at Glasgow, having succeeded Robert Simpson, M.D. the editor of Euclid, whose life he published in 4to. 1812. Dr. Trail was also editor of the "Porisms of Pappus," and other mathematical works. He married at Edinburgh, April 29, 1799, lady Frances Charteris, aunt to the present earl of Wemyss and March.



## DEATHS.—FEB.

3. In Duchess-street, Thomas Hope, esq. The Hopes of Amsterdam, whose names have been proverbial for wealth, and for their extensive collections of works of art, are a younger branch of the family seated at Craig-hall in Fife-shire, which enjoys a baronetcy of Nova Scotia. The gentleman now deceased was one of three brothers, one of whom still resides at Amsterdam. Early in life, Mr. Thomas Hope travelled over various parts of Europe, Asia, and Africa; and having with a refined taste, acquired a facility of drawing, brought home a large collection of sketches, principally of architecture and sculpture. Soon after his return, and settlement in London, he published "A Letter, addressed to F. Annesley, esq. on a series of designs for Downing College, Cambridge," in which, founding his judgment on what he had seen and examined during his travels, he criticised with great severity the designs of Mr. Wyatt. Having purchased a large house in Duchess-street, Mr. Hope devoted much time and study in finishing and fitting up the interior from his own drawings, and partly in imitation of the best specimens, both ancient and modern, in Italy. A description of this House will be found in the first volume of "The Public Buildings of London," by Britton and Pugin, accompanied by two plates representing the Flemish Picture-gallery, which was an addition made in 1820. A view of the old picture-gallery, together with a catalogue of the pictures, was published in Westmacott's "Account of the British Galleries of Painting and Sculpture." Mr. Hope's country mansion was at Deepdene, near Dorking, and thither he had removed a large number of his pictures, sculpture, and books, having built for their reception a new library, a gallery, and an amphitheatre, to arrange and display antiques. In 1805 Mr. Hope published the drawings which he had made for his furniture, &c. in a folio volume, entitled "Household Furniture and Decorations." Notwithstanding the ridicule attempted to be cast on this work in the Edinburgh Review, it led the way to a complete revolution in the upholstery and interior decoration of houses. Mr. Hope was, in all respects, a munificent patron of art. Thorwaldsen, the Danish sculptor, was chiefly indebted to him for the early support and patronage which he experienced. The genius of young Chantrey was called into action by him,

whilst the more mature talents of Flaxman were honourably employed. In one case, his patronage was returned by an act of the basest ingratitude. Some dispute having arisen between Mr. Hope and a Frenchman of the name of Dubost, respecting the price and execution of a painting, the artist vented his spleen by the exhibition of an infamous caricature—a picture which he entitled "Beauty and the Beast;" Mrs. Hope being drawn in the former character, and her husband in the latter, laying his treasures at her feet, and addressing her in the language of the French tale. This picture was publicly exhibited, and attracted such crowds of loungers and scandal-lovers to view it, that from 20*l.* to 30*l.* a day was taken at the doors. It was at length cut to pieces in the room, by Mr. Beresford, the brother of Mrs. Hope. Dubost, upon this, brought an action against that gentleman, laying his damages at 1,000*l.*; but the jury gave him only 5*l.* as the worth of the canvas and colours. In 1809 Mr. Hope published "The Costume of the Ancients," in two volumes, royal 8vo.; in fixing the price of which, in order to promote its more extensive circulation he at once sacrificed 1,000*l.* of the cost. The figures, which were chiefly selected from fictile vases (many of them in Mr. Hope's own collection), are engraved in outline, and the greater part of them by that eminent master in that style, Mr. H. Moses. Three years afterwards Mr. Hope published his "Designs of Modern Costumes," in folio. Mr. Hope's "Anastasius; or Memoirs of a Modern Greek," a romance in three volumes, evinced at once the general knowledge, the fancy, and powers of the author. Besides these works, Mr. Hope contributed several papers to different periodical publications; and at the time of his decease was engaged in passing through the press a volume "On the Origin and Prospects of Man." He left a large collection of drawings and engravings, illustrative of buildings and scenery in Greece, Turkey, Italy, France, Germany, &c. and several plates of his antique sculpture and vases. Mr. Hope married, April 16, 1806, the hon. Louisa Beresford, fifteenth and youngest child of the right rev. lord Decies, lord Archbishop of Tuam, and sister to the present lord Decies. They had three sons, the eldest of whom, Mr. Henry Hope, was a groom of the Bed-chamber to king George the Fourth, and still holds that



## DEATHS.—FEB.

office to his present majesty. Mrs. Hope, also, is woman of the Bedchamber to her majesty; there is a charming portrait of this lady by sir Thomas Lawrence. Mr. Hope's will has been proved by his brother, P. H. Hope, esq. and Jeremiah Harman, esq. to each of whom is left a legacy of 1000*l*. The collection of Italian pictures, articles of vertu, and the furniture, together with the house in Mansfield-street, are left to the eldest son, who is likewise residuary legatee. To his widow is left one thousand pounds in money, to be paid immediately, an annuity of one thousand pounds a year, in addition to the lady's marriage settlement of three thousand a year; and during her life the mansion and furniture at Deepdene. Large legacies are left to his other children and many of his friends are also remembered in his will, especially the rev. William Harness, son of his friend Dr. Harness, to whom he has left 500*l*. Probate was granted for 180,000*l*. personal property. The gallery in Duchess-street, appended to Mr. Hope's house, in which his Italian pictures are deposited, was built by his brother, Mr. P. H. Hope, and the splendid assemblage of pictures by the Dutch and Flemish masters, which are mingled with the Italian school, are the property of Mr. P. H. Hope, by whom they were collected.

4. At Woolwich Common, aged 60, lady Robe, widow of col. sir William Robe, K.C.H., K.C.B., and K.T.S.

— At Badminton, aged 22, lady Isabella Ann wife of Thomas H. Kingscote esq. and sixth daughter of the duke of Beaufort.

5. At Louth, aged 76, Adam Eve, esq. About thirty years ago he established a carpet manufactory at Louth, the first in the county, and by unremitting attention brought it to such perfection, that his goods were held in the highest estimation not only in this kingdom, but in America, where, for several years, he had an extensive contract.

— At Durham, aged 61, Arthur Aylmer, esq. of Walworth Castle, a lieutenant-general in the army, for many years an acting magistrate for the county of Durham and North Riding of Yorkshire, and chairman of the quarter sessions of the county Palatine.

6. At Geneva, aged 63, Rodolph Kreutzer, the celebrated violin player. He was born at Versailles in 1767, the son of a musician in the band of the king of France; and very early in life evinced

considerable talent for music. He received lessons on the violin from Ant. Stamitz, and at the age of 13 played in public, at the Concert Spirituel, a concerto of his master's composition, with great success. At nineteen years of age he had already composed two grand operas, which were performed before the whole court. When that gay circle was violently broken up, he travelled in Germany, Holland, and Italy, and established his fame as one of the first violinists in Europe. At the invitation of Napoleon, he subsequently returned to France, where he received the appointments of first violin to the Emperor, as well in the chapel as for private music, chef-d'orchestre at the opera, and professor of the violin at the Conservatoire. Napoleon often conversed with him in a familiar manner, and conferred on him the gold cross (officer) of the Legion of Honour. Kreutzer continued director of the Academie Royale in Paris, and principal violin professor at the Conservatoire, until deprived of the use of his arm by an accident in 1817. Most of the young violin professors of eminence in France are, therefore, his pupils, and take great credit in calling themselves such. As a composer, Kreutzer also greatly distinguished himself. Besides an immense number of violin concertos, quartets, duets, and a set of excellent studies familiar to all performers on that instrument throughout Europe, he wrote several operas, among which are best known *Lodoiska*, *Paul et Virginie*, *La Mort d'Abel*, and *Arisippe*.

6. Drowned in the river Chagres, in the isthmus of Darien, aged 36, commander Henry Foster, of H.M.S. Chanticleer, F.R.S. Capt. Foster was one of the companions of sir Edward Parry in his voyages to the Arctic regions, and was commissioned in 1828 to make a voyage of scientific discovery in the Chanticleer. His life was lost from the sail by which he was holding over the side of a canoe, accidentally giving way; he fell overboard, and the rapidity of the stream immediately carried him beyond the reach of assistance. His body, having been found by the Indians, was interred at Chagres, where the following inscription has been placed on a brass plate in Fort St. Lorenzo; "This tablet is erected by the late senior lieutenant and officers of H.B.M. sloop Chanticleer, to perpetuate the memory of their late commander, Henry Foster, F.R.S., who was drowned in the river Chagres on the 6th of Feb.



## DEATHS.—FER.

1831, while measuring the difference of longitude between Panama and Chagres. This talented and distinguished officer was employed in nautical and astronomical science, having nearly completed his mission of three years' duration. He fell at his post,—ripe in honours, but young in years. *Ætat.* 36."

6. At Southampton, aged 72, Katharine, relict of admiral sir Richard Grindall, K.C.B. who died in 1819.

— At the residence of lady Murray, Andover, Fanny Caroline, wife of capt. Sidney Widdrington, 53rd regiment, and daughter of the late Thomas Strickland, esq. of Kendal.

— At Hastings, in his 21st year, the hon. Frederick William Robinson, only surviving son of lord Grantham.

7. At Edinburgh, the rev. Andrew Thomson, D.D. minister of St. George's Church, and long an ornament of the Kirk of Scotland. He was returning home from a meeting of Presbytery, and having met a friend at the west end of Prince's-street, he was giving him an account of the proceedings which had taken place. This gentleman walked along with him to his own door, where, stopping for a moment, as if he wished to say something more, he muttered some words indistinctly, and instantly fell down on the pavement. He was carried into his own house in a state of insensibility, and on opening a vein only a few ounces of blood flowed, and he expired. A subscription has been made for the benefit of his family, amounting to about 8,000*l.* It is stated that his majesty, upon the representation of lord Brougham, ordered a pension of 150*l.* a-year for life, to be granted to Mrs. Thomson, the widow.

9. At Eastnor Castle, aged 70, the right hon. Margaret countess of Somers.

10. In Brompton-square, aged 20, Helen Elizabeth, eldest daughter of W. Harvey, esq., and grand-daughter of the late adm. sir H. Harvey, K.B.

— In Cumberland terrace, Regent's-park, after a severe and protracted illness, aged 57, captain Peter Heywood, R.N. Captain Heywood was a son of Peter John Heywood, esq., a Deemster of the Isle of Man, and Seneschal to his grace the duke of Atholl. His grandfather Thomas Heywood, esq. was Chief Justice of the Isle of Man, and his aunt was the wife of admiral sir Thomas Pasley. He was born on June 6, 1773, and entered the navy as a midshipman Oct. 11, 1786. His first voyage was on board

the *Bounty*. When the mutiny occurred, Mr. Heywood, who had not then completed his 16th year, was one of the two midshipmen who remained with Christian. Lieut. Bligh and his companions were turned adrift in the launch on the 28th of April. The mutineers then proceeded with the ship to the Island of Toobouai, where for some months they maintained themselves with difficulty against the resistance of the natives. Many of those who had not been active in the mutiny, then showed themselves reluctant to end their days in this miserable exile; and on the 11th of Sept. it was decided on a show of hands, sixteen against nine, that the former number should be landed at Otaheite, there to await the English vessel which it was certain would be sent after them, and that the *Bounty* should then be relinquished to Mr. Christian and his adherents. At the head of the former party was Mr. Heywood; and after this arrangement had been put into execution, the sixteen remained for six months in peace with the hospitable natives of Otaheite. On the 23rd of March, 1791, the *Pandora* arrived in Matavia Bay in search of the *Bounty*; and scarcely had she anchored when Messrs. Heywood and Stewart (the other midshipman detained by Christian) paddled off in a canoe and made themselves known to her commander, the late adm. Edward Edwards. They were instantly ordered to be put in irons, and their subsequent treatment was attended with such severity as shewed that lieut. Bligh, in reporting the loss of his ship, had made no discrimination between the innocent and the guilty. All the survivors of the crew of the *Bounty* (except two, who had gone to reside in the peninsula of Teiarraboo) were secured in a small prison, only fourteen feet in length which was built on the quarter-deck of the *Pandora*. They had already passed four months in this condition, when, on the 28th of August, the *Pandora* was wrecked on the reef between New Holland and New Guinea; and midshipman Stewart and three others of the prisoners were drowned in their irons! The remaining eight having, almost at the last minute, obtained the keys of their shackles, reached the shore in safety,—Mr. Heywood floated by the assistance of a plank, until he was picked up by a boat. On mustering the survivors, it was found that thirty-nine men including four of the prisoners, had met with a watery grave.



## DEATHS.—FEB.

Their sufferings and privations were not, however, yet concluded; the prisoners were kept at a distance from the tents formed for the crew, without the least covering to protect their naked bodies from the scorching rays of a vertical sun by day, and the chilling effect of heavy dews by night. Their food was confined to two ounces of bread, and one gill of wine or water a day; and this was endured for three days on the sand bank, and sixteen in an open boat at sea, until they arrived at Copang on the 16th of September. From thence they were conveyed to Batavia, and forwarded to the Cape of Good Hope, in Dutch vessels; and the *Goragon* brought them home to Spithead June 19, 1792. To these bodily sufferings, the mental anxieties of a public trial, affecting both his honour and his life, were now to succeed. The investigation took place in September, 1792. In a plain and unvarnished statement, he declared that he was entirely ignorant of the mutiny before the morning on which it took place; that from all he could gather from those of the officers with whom he had the opportunity of speaking, it was the general opinion that certain destruction awaited those who were dismissed in the launch with lieutenant Bligh; and that self-preservation was the sole motive that induced him to resolve to remain in the ship; to which alternative he was finally forced by an order of Christian to keep Messrs. Heywood and Stewart below, which was done until the launch was far astern. As he stood neuter, the court did not hesitate to pronounce Mr. Heywood guilty, but with the strongest recommendations to the mercy of the Crown. On the 27th of October, 1792, Mr. Heywood received the king's free and unconditional pardon. Lord Hood who had presided at his trial, earnestly recommended him to embark again as a midshipman without delay, and offered to take him under his own patronage, in the *Victory*. This, however, was declined by his uncle, Commodore Pasley, whose ship the *Bellerophon*, he joined on the 17th of May, 1793; and who soon after placed him in the *Niger* frigate, capt. the hon. A. Legge, with whom he served as master's mate until the 23rd, Sept. following, when he joined the *Queen Charlotte*, the flag-ship of earl Howe's fleet. In that ship Mr. Heywood served as signal midshipman and master's mate, under his lordship's own eye. In the actions with the French fleet of May 28 and 29, and June 1, 1794,

Mr. Heywood did his duty on the quarter-deck as an aid-de-champ to sir A. S. Douglas; and after the return of the victorious fleet to Spithead, he was selected to be one of the two midshipmen appointed to attend the side whenever the king visited the *Queen Charlotte*. In March 1795, Mr. Heywood was appointed lieutenant in the Incendiary fireship, and in the following month to the *Nymph* of forty guns, captain George Murray, which on the 23rd of June was present at the capture of three French line-of-battle ships, by lord Bridport's fleet near l'Orient. In Jan. 1796, lieutenant Heywood was appointed to the *Fox*, of thirty-two guns, in which he served on the North Sea station until the ensuing summer, when she sailed for India, as convoy to the outward-bound trade. On her arrival at the Cape of Good Hope, he became the senior lieutenant. In August 1800 he was promoted to the command of the *Vulcan* bomb, which he joined at Amboyna. He subsequently commanded the *Trincomalee* of eighteen guns. *Trident* sixty-four, *Leopard* fifty, and *Dedaigneuse* frigate. His post commission was confirmed by the admiralty April 5, 1803, and he remained on the East-India station chiefly employed on confidential detached services, until Jan. 1805, when he resigned his ship, and returned home. In Oct. 1806, rear-admiral George Murray selected captain Heywood for his flag-captain in the *Polyphemus* sixty-four; which was employed in the unsuccessful expedition for the recovery of Buenos Ayres, and of which he retained the command to May 1808. He subsequently acted as captain of the *Donegal*, during the absence of her proper commander sir Pulteney Malcolm, and on the 18th of March, 1809, received the thanks of the admiralty for his gallantry in the attack on three French frigates, which were destroyed in the *Sable d'Olonne*. In May 1809 he was appointed to the *Nereus*, a new thirty-six gun frigate, in which he served for some time on the Channel and Mediterranean stations. He returned to England with the remains of vice-adm. lord Collingwood, in April 1810. He was afterwards employed for three years on the coast of South America, with the exception of a short visit home in Jan. 1812, and received the thanks of several mercantile bodies for the protection he had afforded to their commercial interests. Having been appointed to the *Montagu* seventy-four, he took his final



## DEATHS.—FEB.

departure in the summer of 1813, and after refitting at Portsmouth, was employed for some months on the North Sea station. In 1815 captain Heywood joined lord Exmouth's fleet in the Mediterranean; and he afterwards continued the senior officer at Gibraltar, until ordered to accompany his lordship on his first mission to the Barbary States, in Feb. 1816.

12. At Mangersbury-park, Gloucestershire, aged 64, Edward John Chamberlayne, esq. deputy lieut. and justice of the peace for the counties of Oxford, Worcester, and Gloucester.

13. At his residence in Bath, aged 62, rear-admiral sir Edward Berry, bart. K.C.B. This distinguished officer had been several years suffering under severe illness and extreme debility, the effect of paralysis, which rendered him totally incapable of taking upon himself the active duties of his profession. He was the only officer in his majesty's navy who had the honour of three medals, having commanded a line-of-battle ship in the battles of the Nile, Trafalgar, and St. Domingo.

14. At St. James's-palace, aged 87, Mrs. Ann Boscawen, who was for above fifty-four years in the family of queen Charlotte. She was the eldest daughter of general the hon. George Boscawen, by Anne, daughter of John Morley Trevor, of Trevallyn, co. Denbigh, esq.

14. At Drylawhill, East Lothian, aged 73, Robert Brown, esq., an excellent writer on agriculture, and a contemporary and intimate acquaintance of the late George Rennie, esq. of Phantassie. He was born in the village of East Linton, where he entered into business: but his natural genius soon led him to agricultural pursuits, which he followed with singular success. He commenced his agricultural career at Westfortune, and soon afterwards removed to Markle. His "View of the Agriculture of the West Riding of Yorkshire," 8vo. 1799; his "Treatise on Rural Affairs," 2 vols. 8vo. 1811, and his articles in the "Edinburgh Farmer's Magazine" (of which he was conductor during fifteen years) evinced the soundness of his practical knowledge.

15. At Gloucester, aged 71, David Walker, esq. for upwards of thirty years proprietor of the "Gloucester Journal."

— At Lambeth, Henry Maudslay, esq. engineer.

16. In Francis-street, Bedford-square, aged 63, William Tucker, esq.

16. In Harley-street, aged 77, lady Earle, widow of sir James Earle, of Hanover-square, knt. F. R. S. surgeon extraordinary to king George III. Her ladyship was one of the daughters of the late Percival Pott, surgeon; and sister of the ven. archd. Pott.

— At Christ Church, Oxford, aged 18, lord Conyers Osborne, younger son of the duke of Leeds. His death was occasioned in wrestling, by extravasation of blood on the spinal marrow. A Coroner's inquest returned a verdict of death by chance medley.

17. At his house in Brighton, aged 68, William Jones, esq. of Islington, and of the firm of W. and S. Jones, opticians, Holborn.

18. At Cricket St. Thomas, aged 85, the right hon. Mary Sophia Dowager viscountess Bridport.

20. At Cosgrove, Northamptonshire, aged 67, Millicent, widow of the rev. Joseph Thomas, of Epsom, and only surviving child of the late rev. John Parkhurst, author of the Greek and Hebrew Lexicons. Mrs. Thomas was learned in the Hebrew and Greek languages, and, since her father's death, when a new edition of either Lexicon was printed, she corrected the press. She assisted her friend Miss Starke in translating Madame de Genlis's Theatre of Education, in 3 vols. 12mo. 1783-8,

21. At Bristol, aged 68, the rev. Robert Hall, M.A. pastor of the Baptist church, Broadmead, in that city, one of the most eminent ministers of that communion. He was son of the rev. Robert Hall, minister of the Particular Baptists at Arnsby in Leicestershire, some notices of whom will be found in Nichols's history of that county, vol. iv. pp. 13, 417. For his education he was first placed under the care of the rev. Dr. Ryland, at Northampton, and then sent to the Baptist academy at Bristol, whence he proceeded in 1781 to the King's-college at Aberdeen. After four years residence there, he returned to the academy at Bristol to become assistant to Dr. Caleb Evans, in which situation he continued until 1791, when he succeeded the rev. Robert Robertson, as minister at Cambridge. Whilst there resident he became known to, and admired by, some of the most distinguished scholars of the age. Dr. Parr said of him, "Mr. Hall has, like bishop Taylor, the eloquence of an orator, the fancy of a poet, the acuteness of a schoolman, the profoundness of a philosopher, and the



## DEATHS.—FEB.

piety of a saint." It was said that he was offered ordination by bishop Barrington. From Cambridge about 1804 he removed to Leicester, where he was pastor of the meeting in Harvey-lane until invited to succeed Dr. Ryland at Bristol in 1826. Mr. Hall's publications appeared under the following titles: "Christianity consistent with the love of Freedom, being an answer to a sermon by the rev. John Clayton," 1791, 8vo.—"Apology for the Freedom of the Press, and for general Liberty, with remarks on bishop Horsley's sermon preached 13th Jan. 1793," 8vo.—"Modern Infidelity considered with respect to its influence on society; a sermon preached at Cambridge, 1800," 8vo.—"Reflections on War, a sermon, on June 1, 1802, being the day of thanksgiving for a General Peace."—"The Sentiments proper to the present crisis, a Fast sermon at Bristol, Oct. 19, 1803."—"The effects of Civilization on the people in European States, 1805."—"The advantage of Knowledge to the Lower Classes, a sermon at Leicester, 1810."—"The discouragements and supports of the Christian minister, an ordination sermon, 1812."—"The character of the late rev. Thomas Robinson, vicar of St. Mary's, Leicester." 1813.—"Address to the Public on an important subject connected with the renewal of the charter of the East India Company." 1813.—"An Address to the rev. Eustace Carey, Jan. 19, 1814, on his designation as a Christian Missionary to India."—"On Terms of Communion; with a particular view to the case of the Baptists and the Pædo-Baptists." 1815.—"The essential difference between Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John, more fully stated and confirmed."—"A Sermon occasioned by the death of the princess Charlotte of Wales, preached at Leicester, 1817."—"A Sermon on the death of Dr. Ryland, 1826." Mr. Hall was for some time one of the conductors of the "Eclectic Review." The name of Mr. Hall stood prominent as one of the first pulpit orators of the day; his oratory was not loud, forcible, and overpowering, but was soft, mellifluous, rich, deep and fluent, and was imbued with an earnestness and fervency which impressed his audience with the sincerity of his belief.

22. In Bruton-street, aged 82, Martha, widow of sir Claude Scott, bart.

25. At Cheney Longueville, Salop,

Richard Duppa, esq. high sheriff of co Radnor.

25. At his house in the Royal-crescent, Bath, aged 75, sir John Palmer Acland, of Fairfield, co. Somerset, and Newhouse, co. Devon, bart.

26. At Dorking, aged 82, John Sims, M.D., F.R.S., and F.L.S. He was the editor of "Curtis's Botanical Magazine," from the 14th to the 42nd volume, and contributed several professional papers to the "Medical Facts," and "Medical and Physical Journal."

— At Fulham, aged 86, John Bell, esq. formerly of the Strand, bookseller. He was one of the original proprietors of the Morning Post; and projector of that well-established Sunday newspaper, "Bell's Weekly Messenger." Another of his successful projects was the elegant monthly publication, "La Belle Assemblée."

27. Aged 24, Annette, youngest daughter of the late hon. Robert Molesworth, of Beaulieu, co. Louth, Ireland, and niece to the late viscounts Ranelagh and Molesworth.

*Lately.* At Lisban, near Kirkeubbin, Mr. Bernard Darian, aged 100. From five years of age he enjoyed uninterrupted good health until two days previous to his death.

At Bellevue, near Dublin, Elizabeth, widow of lieutenant-col. Hugh Henry.

At Dublin, in her 20th year, lady Jane Anne Louisa Florence Cole, only daughter of the earl of Enniskillen, and niece to the marquis of Anglesea.

At Limerick, Alfred Wilson, Trevelyan, esq. late of the 32nd reg. fourth and youngest son of sir John Trevelyan, bart., of Nettlecombe-court, Somerset, and Wallington, Northumberland, by Maria, daughter of sir Thomas Spencer Wilson, bart.

— At Bishopston, co. Glamorgan, aged 75, the rev. Edward Davies, chancellor of Brecon, rector of Bishopston and Llanwair Orllodyn, and perpetual curate of Llanbedr Painscastle; author of "Celtic Researches," &c. Mr. Davies was born in Radnorshire, of humble parentage; and entered the church with very moderate expectations. In 1788 he published a small volume of juvenile verses under the title of *Vacunalia*; and about 1796, anonymously in two vols. a little tale called *Eliza Powell, or Trials of Sensibility*. In 1801 he was resident as curate at Olveston near Thornbury in Gloucestershire, when his essays on Celtic



## DEATHS.—MARCH.

antiquities first attracted the notice of the late Mr. Justice Hardinge : and so warmly did Mr. Hardinge exert himself in his favour, that he not only procured for him a numerous list of subscribers to his works, but the more lasting advantage of preferment in the church. His projected work, at length appeared in 1804, under the title of “Celtic Researches on the origin, traditions, and languages of the Ancient Britons ; with some introductory sketches on Primitive Society.” In 1809 Mr. Davies published “The Rights and Mythology of the British Druids, ascertained by national documents, and compared with the general traditions and customs of Heathenism, as illustrated by the most eminent Antiquaries of our age. With an appendix containing ancient poems and extracts, with some remarks on ancient British coins.” Mr. Davies was for some time Master of the Grammar school at Chipping Sudbury near Bristol. He was presented to Llanbedr Painscastle in 1802 ; and collated to Bishopston and to Llandwair Orledyn in 1816, the former being in the patronage of the see of Llandaff, and the latter of the see of St. David’s. In 1824 Mr. Davies was nominated, on the recommendation of his patron bishop Burgess, the president, one of the Royal Associates of the Royal Society of Literature.

*Latelly.* Lord Charles Somerset. In 1814 he was appointed governor and commander-in-chief of the Cape of Good Hope, where he remained until about two years before his death.

— At Shirley, aged 35, Mr. Alfred S. Powell, author of a work on the Battle of the Nile, written while a shepherd’s boy, and dedicated to adm. Otway.

## MARCH.

3. At Wembury-house, Henry Edward Thornton, esq. eldest son of the right hon. sir Edward Thornton, esq., G.C.B.

6. At Pisa, aged 32, the hon. John Kennedy Erskine, captain on half-pay of the 16th Lancers, and equerry to the king. He was the younger son of Archibald earl of Cassilis, by Margaret, daughter of John Erskine, esq. and took the name of Erskine after his paternal name. He was married July 5, 1827, to Miss Augusta Fitzclarence, fourth daughter of his majesty, by whom he had a son, born in 1828, and a daughter,

Amelia, born in 1829. He had been for some time abroad, on account of ill health.

7. At his seat, Mulgrave Castle, Yorkshire, died, in his 77th year, Henry earl of Mulgrave, viscount Normanby, baron Mulgrave, G. C. B., a general in the army, and Colonel of the 31st regiment. His lordship’s first service was in the American war, where he acquired considerable distinction. He was afterwards signalized in the expedition against Toulon, in the year 1793, at the opening of the revolutionary war. He filled, in succession, the posts of chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, secretary for foreign affairs, first lord of the Admiralty, and master-general of the Ordnance, in the Pitt, Percival, and Liverpool administrations. The last-named office he resigned in the year 1818.

8. At his seat, New Hall, Wiltshire, John Thomas Batt, esq. M. A. barrister-at-law, and one of his majesty’s justices of the peace and deputy-Lieuts. for that county. He was descended from a respectable family long resident in the parish of Downton, being the son of John Thomas Batt, M. D., and grandson of William Batt, esq., by Martha, daughter and heiress of Jonathan Clarke, of Nunton-house, esq. Educated at Westminster and Christ Church, Oxford, he was called to the bar, and for some time went the western circuit, where he obtained the confidence of the future premier William Pitt. That statesman, when he came into power, gratified his own feelings of friendship by placing Mr. Batt in the office of auditor for the Irish accounts. In this situation he remained many years, enjoying the society of archbishop Markham, bishop Barrington, Brown, Skinner, Gibbon the historian (who chose him for an executor,) lord Sheffield, and many others equally eminent in public life.

— At Sidney, New South Wales, aged 65, the rev. Lawrence Hynes Halloran, D.D.—This gentleman, who was apparently a native of Ireland, was formerly master of Alington academy near Exeter, where he educated lord Gifford, the late master of the Rolls. He published two volumes of poetry in 1790 and 1791 ; and an Ode on their majesties’ visit to that city in the latter year. In 1801 he printed “Lacrymæ Hibernicæ, or the Genius of Erin’s Complaint, a ballad ;” and under the name of Philo-Nauticus, a drama entitled



## DEATHS.—MARCH.

“the Female Volunteer.” He was subsequently a chaplain in the Navy; and was in that capacity on board lord Nelson’s flag-ship the *Britannia*, at the battle of Trafalgar, and published a Poem on the battle. He afterwards held the appointments of rector of the public grammar-school at the Cape of Good Hope, and chaplain to the forces in South Africa; there he stepped so far out of his province as to interfere very warmly on occasion of a duel which took place between two officers about the beginning of 1810, and when the affair was brought before a court martial, wrote the defence of the accused parties. His conduct was highly disapproved by the lieutenant-general the hon. H. G. Grey, who ordered his removal to an outpost called Simon’s Town. The Doctor resigned his office of chaplain, but gave vent to his anger in “*Cap-Abilities, or South African characteristics, a Satire*,” for which a suit was commenced against him, and he was sentenced to be banished from the colony, and to pay costs. He afterwards published the “*Proceedings, Correspondence*,” &c. 8vo. 1811. In 1812 he circulated “*Stanzas of affectionate regard to the memory of capt. Dawson of the Piedmontaise*,” 4to. In 1818 at the Old Bailey sessions he was convicted of forging a frank, and was sentenced to seven years transportation.

8. At St. Lucie, major-gen. George Mackie, C.B. governor of that colony.

10. At Easton Hall, Lincolnshire, aged 58, sir Montague Cholmeley, bart. D.C.L.

11. In Sloane-street, Frances Anne Mary, wife of Thomas Hoblyn, esq. of the treasury, and daughter of Mr. Chaworth, who was killed in a duel by lord Byron.

— At St. Petersburg, Kozlovsky, an eminent musical composer, whose productions are highly popular in Russia.

12. At Worlitz, in Dessau, in his 71st year, Friedrich Mathisson, the well-known German poet and tourist.

15. On the 15th of March, in Baker-street, John Hope Smith, esq. late governor-in-chief of the British settlements on the Gold Coast. Respectably born and educated, he was placed at Cape Coast Castle by his father, as a writer in the service of the African Committee, at the early age of fourteen. He was selected for a dangerous service in the first Ashantee war. The enemy surrounded the fortress of Annamaboo, and its inhabitants were reduced to the

last hope of defence, when Mr. Smith was sent to demand a truce, and afterwards assisted in securing one of the rebel chiefs. This man was taken at the imminent risk of all engaged in the task, and Mr. Smith was ordered to conduct him by sea from head-quarters to Annamaboo. Bound to the bottom of the canoe, he yet attempted, by means of a knife concealed about him, to scuttle her, and in one moment all would have sunk with her; but the vigilant eye of the young officer detected the scheme, and saved himself and soldiers from destruction. In consequence of his excellent conduct, Mr. Smith was made the bearer of the despatches to England. Shortly after his return to Africa, he succeeded to the command of a fortress. At the age of thirty he was appointed governor-in-chief, being promoted to that station out of the usual routine, in consequence of his merits. The mission to Ashantee took place during Mr. Smith’s command, when the uncle and nephew formed a treaty of peace and commerce with these barbarians, which would have been a lasting advantage to England, had it not been overthrown by subsequent interference. On the resignation of the settlements into the immediate hands of government, Mr. Smith was offered either a pension of 700*l.* per annum, or a regiment, and the continuance of his command at Cape Coast, subject to the control of the Staff at Sierra Leone. Mr. Smith’s views but ill accorded with those of the late sir Charles M’Carthy, and accepting the usual pension, he withdrew from public service. A life of tranquillity and retirement was but little suited to his habits and feelings, and he by turns resided in the different countries of Europe. A severe cold, caught and neglected in Paris, prompted his return to England, and, after five weeks’ of suffering, he expired, in a rapid consumption, at the age of forty-four.

— In his 79th year, Thomas Payne, esq. many years an eminent bookseller in Pall-mall, and highly respected in the literary world.

— At his seat, Cobham Hall, the earl of Darnley. His youngest son was appointed, last November, his majesty’s secretary of legation at Florence; but the earl himself never accepted any official situation. His lordship was a claimant of the Scotch dukedom of Lennox, a title at present borne by the duke of Richmond.

16. Drowned, on board the steam-



## DEATHS.—MARCH.

packet, Frolic, which was wrecked between Milford and Bristol, lieut.-col. William Gordon, formerly of the 2nd Dragoon Guards.

21. Aged 94, at Bath, the hon. Mrs. Noel, relict of the dean of Salisbury.

22. At Cottesbrooke, Northampton, Patience Ann, wife of the hon. and rev. Paul Anthony Irby, eldest daughter of the late sir William Champion de Crespigny, bart, by lady Sarah Windsor, fourth daughter of the fourth earl of Plymouth.

23. Aged 76, the ven. Ralph Churton, M.A., archdeacon of St. David's, rector of Middleton Cheney, Northamptonshire, and F.S.A. He was born Dec. 8, 1754, in the parish of Malpas, and was the younger of two sons of Thomas Churton, yeoman, and Sarah Clemson. At a proper age he was put to the grammar school at Malpas, with wishes, rather than any just hopes, of bringing him up to the church. Both his parents died; but he continued at school; and his master, the rev. Mr. Evans, recommended him to Dr. Townson, the rector of the parish, who made him presents of books, and frequently assisted and directed his studies. By Dr. Townson's recommendation, he was entered at Brasen-nose in 1772; and the same generous hand contributed one half towards his academical expenses. In 1778, Mr. Churton was elected a fellow of his college; in 1785, he was chosen Bampton lecturer; appointed Whitehall preacher by bishop Porteus in 1788; in 1792, he was presented by his college to the living of Middleton Cheney; and he was collated to the archdeaconry of St. David's by bishop Burgess, in 1805. The protection of Townson, and his own rising merit, procured him, early in his academic life, many valued friends. Among those with whom he was on habits of intimacy, were the learned and pious Lewis Bagot, bishop of St. Asaph, and dean of Christ Church; sir Roger Newdigate, bart. a name now long endeared to the "Oxford Muses;" the excellent and learned Dr. Winchester, author of the "Dissertation on the 18th Article of the Church of England;" and the amiable naturalist, and sincere Christian, Gilbert White, whose hospitable roof at Selborne, Hants, generally received him at Christmas to what its owner called a winter migration. The archdeacon was the author of a numerous list of works, chiefly in divinity and ecclesiastical biography. The titles of the principal of these are as follow:—"Bampton Lec-

tures: eight Sermons on the Prophecies relating the destruction of Jerusalem, preached before the University of Oxford, 1785," 8vo. "A Memoir of Thomas Townson, D.D. archdeacon of Richmond, and rector of Malpas, Cheshire," &c. prefixed to a "Discourse on the Evangelical History from the Interment to the Ascension," published after Dr. Townson's death by John Loveday, esq. D.C.L. Oxford, 1793. This memoir has been wholly or in part thrice reprinted; in 1810, prefixed to an edition of Townson's whole works, 2 vols. 8vo.; in 1828, with a private impression of "Practical Discourses," by the late archdeacon Townson, edited by the present distinguished and venerated bishop of Limerick; and in 1830, with the same discourses published by Messrs. Cochran and Duncan. "The Lives of William Smyth, bishop of Lincoln, and sir Richard Sutton, knight, founders of Brazen-Nose College, Oxford, 1800." 8vo. To this work a supplement was published in 1803. "The Life of Alexander Nowel, dean of St. Paul's, &c. Oxford, 1809," 8vo. "The Works of Thomas Townson, D.D. with an Account of the Author, an Introduction to the Discourses on the Gospels, and a Sermon on the Quotations in the Old Testament, 1810." 2 vols. The last publication from his pen was a short Memoir of his friend the classical and accomplished Dr. Richard Chandler, prefixed to a new edition of his "Travels in Asia Minor and Greece." 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford, 1825.

24. In Berkeley-square, aged 53, the hon. Frances Caulfeild, widow of St. George Caulfeild, of Dunamore Castle, county Galway, esq. aunt to lord Crofton.

26. At Sidmouth, in his 66th year, Wm. Mackie, esq. late senior member of the Medical Board, on the Bombay establishment.

— At Coventry-house, Piccadilly, aged 72. the right hon. George William Coventry, seventh earl of Coventry, and viscount Deerhurst, county Gloucester (1697), lord lieutenant and custos rotularum of Worcestershire, recorder of Worcester, high bailiff of Tewkesbury, and high steward of Evesham.

— At his seat, Maristow House, in Devonshire, aged 76, sir Mannasseh Masseh Lopes, bart. a magistrate for that county, and for Wiltshire, and recorder of Westbury. The ancestors of this gentleman were Spanish Jews; he was born in Jamaica, Jan. 27, 1755; the only son of Mordecai Rodrigues Lopes, of Clap-



## DEATH.—APRIL.

ham in Surrey, esq. by Rebecca, daughter of Manasseh Perera, of Jamaica. He was first returned to parliament at the general election in 1802, as member for New Romney; and, during that parliament, was created a baronet by patent dated Nov. 1, 1805, with remainder to his nephew, Ralph Franco, esq. only son of his late sister Esther, wife of Abraham Franco. In the same year he obtained the royal sign manual to take the name of Masseh before his own. At the general election of 1812, sir Manasseh was returned to parliament for Barnstaple, and he was re-elected in 1818. On the 18th of March, 1819, he was found guilty at the Exeter assizes of having corrupted and bribed the electors of the borough of Grampound, in order to get himself returned, having given the voters 35*l.* each. On the 2d of April, on the motion of Mr. Wynn, the House of Commons ordered that the attorney-general should prosecute sir M. M. Lopes for bribery. On the 13th of November he received sentence in the court of King's Bench, "That for sir Manasseh Masseh Lopes's first offence, of which he had been convicted in Cornwall, he should pay to the king a fine of 8,000*l.*, and be imprisoned in Exeter goal for twenty-one months; and for his second offence in Devonshire, that he should pay to the king a fine of 2,000*l.*, and be further imprisoned in the same gaol for three months." In 1823, sir Manasseh again came into parliament for his own borough of Westbury; and was re-elected in 1826, but retired in 1829, to make room for the right hon. Robert Peel. Sir M. M. Lopes married Charlotte, daughter of John Yeates, of Monmouthshire, esq. His daughter Esther died July 1, 1819, aged twenty-four. He was succeeded in his title, according to the patent, by his nephew, now sir Ralph Lopes, having taken that name since his uncle's decease. The value of the landed and personal effects of the late baronet was estimated to exceed 800,000*l.*

29. In Gloucester-place, Portmansquare, aged 54, sir Henry Hawley, second baronet, of Leybourne-grange, Kent.

31. At her house in Curzon-street, May Fair, aged 66, lady Caroline Waldegrave. Her ladyship was born March 1, 1765, the fourth and youngest daughter of John third earl of Waldegrave, and of lady Elizabeth Gower, his wife, sister to the late marquis of Stafford.

*Lately*, Sir William Payne Gallwey,

bart. a general in the army, and colonel of the 3rd dragoon guards; half-brother to the late lord Lavington, and brother-in-law to the earl of Dunraven.

— At Sevenoaks, the hon. Henrietta Burton, sister to the marquis of Conyngham.

## APRIL.

1. At Ballintemple, co. Carlow, by the explosion of a gun, aged 10, the youngest son of sir Thomas Butler, bart.

2. Aged 71, Susannah, widow of Joshua Walker, esq. of Clifton-house, Rotherham, and of Blyth-hall, Notts.

4. At Islington, aged 83, Mr. John Quick, the celebrated comedian. He was born in 1748, and left his father, a brewer in Whitechapel, when only fourteen years of age, to become an actor. He commenced his career at Fulham, where he performed the character of Altamont in the *Fair Penitent*, which he personified so much to the satisfaction of the manager, that he desired his wife to set young Quick down a whole share, which, at the close of the farce, amounted to three shillings. In the counties of Kent and Surrey he figured away with great success; and, before he was eighteen, performed *Hamlet*, *Romeo*, *Richard*, *George Barnwell*, *Jaffier*, *Tancred*, and many other characters in the higher walk of tragedy. In a few years he sufficiently distinguished himself as an actor of such versatile talents, that he was engaged by Mr. Foote, at the Haymarket theatre, in the year 1769, where he became a great favourite of king George the Third; and upon all occasions Quick was expected to appear in a prominent character. He was the original *Tony Lumpkin*, *Acres*, and *Isaac Mendosa*, and after his appearance in these characters, he stood before the public as the *Liston* of the day. Mr. Quick may be considered one of the last of the Garrick school. In 1798 he quitted the stage, after thirty-six years of its toils, and excepting a few nights at the Lyceum, after the destruction of Covent Garden theatre, he did not again act. The evening of his life was calm domestic sunshine. He retired with 10,000*l.* Almost up to the last day of his life he was in the habit of joining a respectable company who frequent the King's Head, opposite Islington church, by whom he was recognised as president. Forty years ago he was told by the physicians that punch would be



## DEATHS.—APRIL.

the death of him. He had then drank it twenty years, and he continued the practice till the day of his death, which it did not appear to have hastened.

5. At the Vicarage, Hornchurch, Essex, in consequence of a violent cold and inflammation of the chest, aged 61, the rev. John Walker, B.C.L., late fellow of New College, and vicar of Hornchurch, to which living he was presented by the warden and fellows of New College, in 1819. Mr. Walker was one of the original proprietors of the *Oxford Herald*, and for several years assisted in its editorial department. He was the editor of the "Selections from the Gentleman's magazine," in 4 vols. 8vo., of which 1000 copies were sold in a few months; he also published letters from the Bodleian library, 3 vols. 8vo.; a pamphlet entitled "*Curia Oxoniensis; or Observations on the Statutes which relate to the University Court, on the illegality of Searching Houses, on the Procuratorial Office, and on the University Police Act,*" of which two editions were sold, and a third lately printed; "*Oxoniana,*" in 4 vols. 12mo. and some other works.

— In Curzon-street, Maria Anne, wife of J. H. Penruddock, esq. M.P. for Wilton.

7. Aged 54, Walter Burrell, of West Grinstead, esq. knight in parliament for Sussex, only surviving brother of sir Charles Merrik Burrell, and cousin to lord Willoughby D'Eresby.

— In Bruton-street, the right hon. Jane countess dowager of Carhampton. She was a daughter of George Boyd, esq. was married June 25, 1776, to Henry Lawes, second earl of Carhampton, and left his widow, without issue, April 25, 1821.

8. At Exeter, aged 81, the rev. J. Bradford, Copleston, B.A. a prebendary of that cathedral, &c. and father of the bishop of Llandaff.

10. At Calgarth Park, Westmorland, Dorothy, relict of Dr. Watson, bishop of Llandaff.

12. At Paddington Green, aged 70, the rev. Basil Woodd, for thirty-eight years minister of Bentinck chapel, Marylebone, and rector of Drayton Beauchamp, Bucks.

13. At Garscube, near Glasgow (the seat of his brother-in-law, sir Archibald Campbell, of Succoth, bart.) sir John Connell, knight, procurator of the church of Scotland, and late judge of the high court of admiralty in that kingdom.

He received the honour of knighthood April 20, 1826.

13. At Buckerell, aged *one hundred and six*, Mrs. Ann Marks.

14. At Paris, M. L'Abbé de Pompières, Father of the Chamber of Deputies.

— At Wem, county Salop, aged 75, the rev. Brian Hill, M.A. uncle to gen. lord Hill, G.C.B. and great uncle to sir Rowland Hill, of Hawkstone, bart. He was the author of the following publications: "*Christian Zeal Recommended and Enforced,*" a sermon preached in St. Chad's church, Shrewsbury, at the anniversary meeting of the Salop Infirmary, 1780. "*Henry and Acasto,*" a moral tale, with a preface by his brother, the late sir Richard Hill, 1790. "*Observations and Remarks on a Journey through Sicily and Calabria, in the year 1791;*" to this octavo volume is appended a postscript containing some account of the "*Ceremonies of the Holy Week at Rome;*" and of "*A Short Excursion to Tivoli.*" The work is dedicated to the earl and countess of Leven and Melville, and written in the form of a diary. A funeral sermon, preached in St. Edmund's, Shrewsbury, on the death of the rev. Richard de Courcy, vicar of that parish, 1803. In 1805, Mr. Hill edited a volume of sermons of Mr. De Courcy's, to which he affixed a long preface. In 1822, Mr. Hill printed a volume of twenty-four sermons on practical subjects, published for the benefit of a charity school in the village of Weston, where they were occasionally preached; in 1826, "*A Sermon preached in the parish church of Shrewsbury, on the death of the rev. John Major, vicar of that parish;*" and in 1828, he edited a small pamphlet entitled, "*Cursory Thoughts on Education.*"

15. At the public office, Lambeth-street, Matthew Wyatt, esq. of the Inner Temple, the resident magistrate of that district.

17. At Park-place, St. James's, in the 45th year of his age, sir T. Mostyn, bart. of Mostyn, in Flintshire, and M.P. for that county during the last four parliaments.

18. At Bath, aged 92, Francis Hayward, M.D.

— At Binfield, Berkshire, aged 67, the rev. Henry Dison Gabell, D.D. rector of that parish, of Ashow, Warwickshire, and of St. Laurence, Winchester, and formerly head master of Winchester



## DEATHS.—APRIL.

college. He was educated at Winchester school, and thence elected a fellow of New College, Oxford, where he proceeded only to the degree of B.A. before he was elected master of Warminster school. In 1788 he was presented to the rectory of St. Laurence, in Winchester, by Lord Chancellor Thurlow; and in 1793 he came to make his permanent residence in that city, on being appointed second master of the school. In 1796 he published a pamphlet "On the expediency of altering and amending the Regulations recommended by Parliament for reducing the high price of Corn;" and in 1802 a fast sermon, preached at St. Laurence, Winchester. He proceeded to the degree of M.A. as a member of St. John's college, Cambridge, in 1807; and succeeded to the head mastership of the school on the resignation of Dr. Goddard in 1810. In 1812 he was presented by Chandos Leigh, esq. to the rectory of Ashow, in Warwickshire; and in 1820 by Lord Chancellor Eldon, to that of Binfield in Berkshire. He resigned the mastership of Winchester at the close of 1823; when the scholars presented him with a magnificent present of plate, consisting of a candelabrum weighing 200 ounces.

20. At Enfield, aged 66, John Abernethy, esq. F.R.S., the eminent surgeon and anatomical lecturer. It is said, that he was himself ignorant of the place of his nativity. Shortly after his birth, however, his parents had taken up their abode in London. After imbibing the elementary principles of grammatical and classical instruction at a day-school in Lothbury, he was apprenticed to Mr., afterwards sir Charles Blick, surgeon to St. Bartholomew's hospital, under whose auspices he pursued his studies to great advantage. About this period he is related to have attended the lectures in the habit of a groom, which acquired for him the appellation of "the ostler;" notwithstanding which, and his oddities in conversation and behaviour, he made himself practically conversant with his profession; and without exhibiting any thing like uncommon attainments, excited expectations which have not been disappointed. On the resignation of Mr. Pott, he became assistant-surgeon at St. Bartholomew's hospital, and afterwards succeeded that gentleman as lecturer on anatomy and surgery. Soon after, Mr. Abernethy appeared as an author, and published "Surgical Obser-

vations," and "Lectures Explanatory of Mr. Hunter's Opinions of the Vital Processes," with a Hunterian Oration, giving a further account of Mr. Hunter's labours and character. He also wrote for Dr. Rees's Cyclopædia the anatomical and physiological articles included under the letters A and B. His publication, of which the greatest number has been printed, as he was accustomed to recommend his patients to "read my book," is entitled "On Local Diseases, Aneurisms, and Disorders of Digestive Organs." His works are altogether comprised in six octavo volumes. On Dr. Marshall relinquishing his popular lectures at Thavies Inn, Mr. Abernethy's class increased, as did his practice. He was some time professor of anatomy to the corporation of surgeons. In his essay, he published an account of cases in which he had tied the external iliac artery for aneurism. This improvement in the science established his fame, and added to the credit of the English school of surgery throughout Europe. St. Bartholomew's hospital, by the reputation of Mr. Abernethy, advanced rapidly, and was esteemed as the first in the metropolis. On the death of his former master, sir Charles Blick, Mr. A. was elected surgeon in his room—and was at one time considered the best lecturer on anatomy, surgery, and pathology in London. He was opposed to the division of surgery into distinct departments, as oculist, aurist, &c. He considered the whole as essentially connected, and that no man properly educated should be ignorant of the diseases which those divisions embrace. Mr. A. was one of the court of assistants of the Royal College of Surgeons, and one of the curators of their museum; he was also an honorary member of the Royal Medical Society of Edinburgh, and of the Medical Societies of Paris and Philadelphia.

20. Aged 70, Augustus Lafontaine, one of the most fruitful German romance writers. He was born at Brunswick, studied divinity in the first instance, then undertook the education of general Thadden's children, and in 1789 became chaplain of a Prussian regiment, which he accompanied in 1792 in the campaign against France. After the peace of Basle, he retired to Halle, where he lived on a pension granted to him by the king of Prussia.

21. Aged 21, John Farsyde Watson, esq. of Bilton Park, near Knaresborough. As an amateur performer on the violin-



## DEATHS.—APRIL.

cello, Mr. W. was inferior only to the celebrated Linley.

22. In Whitehall-place, lady Wetherell, wife of sir C. Wetherell, and daughter of sir Alexander Croke, of Studley-house, Oxfordshire.

— In his 64th year, major-gen. sir G. A. Wood, R. Art. C.B. &c. and governor of Carlisle.

23. At Worthing, in the house of his son-in-law, sir Charles Chad, bart. aged 72, the right hon. Edw. Garth Turnour, second earl of Winterton and viscount Turnour (1766), and baron Winterton, of Gort, county Galway (1761).

— In Clarges-street, James Wedderburn, esq.

— In Verulam-terrace, Frances Mary, second daughter of sir F. Hastings Doyle, bart.

— At Perdiswell, Worcestershire, aged 78, sir Henry Wakeman, bart.

24. In his 40th year, W. Oakes Blount, esq. of Lidiard House, lieutenant R.N. only son of sir Charles Burrell Blount.

— In Russell-square, T. Smith, esq. of Wray, Lancashire, and of the hon. society of Lincoln's-inn.

25. At his chambers in Lincoln's-inn, in his 78th year, John Calthorpe, esq. brother of the first lord Calthorpe, and uncle of the present lord.

— At Apsley House, Piccadilly, aged 58, the most noble Catherine duchess of Wellington, sister to the earl of Longford. She was the third daughter of Edward Michael second lord Longford, by the hon. Catherine Rowley, second daughter of the right hon. Hercules Langford Rowley and Elizabeth viscountess Langford. She was married to the illustrious general April 10, 1806, and has left two sons. The duchess of Wellington was of retiring habits, but her domestic virtues and charities have ever been the theme of admiration. Her remains were interred at Strathfieldsay, attended by her brother-in-law lord Maryborough, as chief mourner; other relations and friends of the duke, in four carriages; and more than thirty private carriages, of which the king, the queen, the dukes of Cumberland and Northumberland, each sent one.

26. In Harley-street, aged 54, the right hon. George de Grey, third lord Walsingham, baron of Walsingham in the county of Norfolk (1780), a lieutenant-general in the army, lieutenant-col. of the first dragoons, and comptroller of the first-fruits office. [See *Chronicle*, p. 67.]

— Aged 58, Montague Talbot, esq.

for twenty-three years manager and proprietor of the Belfast Theatre; and also for many years manager of the Newry and Derry Theatres. He was second son of captain George Talbot, captain of the Worcester man of war, who, with his servant, was lost on the coast of Caffraria, in the Grosvenor East India-man. The captain left a widow, two sons, and a daughter, to deplore his fate. Mr. Montague Talbot, the younger son, was bred to the English bar; but having been much flattered on the dramatic talent he was thought to possess, he was, at a very early age, tempted to try his fortune on the stage.

27. In Southampton-row, in his 69th year, J. Pattison, esq. late a director of the East-India Company.

29. At his seat, Ugbrooke-park, Devonshire, aged 71, the right hon. Charles Clifford, sixth lord Clifford of Chudleigh in Devonshire, (1672), F.S.A.

— Aged 77, the rev. John Baynes, rector of Exton, Hants, and an acting magistrate for that county.

— In Craven-street, Strand, aged 57, George Sayer, esq. rear-admiral of the Blue, and C.B.

30. At Binfield-park, in her 83rd year, Catherine, last surviving sister of the late lord Sunderlin, of Baronston, county Westmeath.

— At Richmond-park, aged 93, the right hon. Elizabeth countess dowager of Pembroke and Montgomery, grandmother of the present earl.

— At Chesterfield, aged 76, Jonathan Stokes, M.D. author of a Botanical Materia Medica, and Botanical Commentaries, of which only the first volume has been published.

— In Lower Connaught-place, aged 75, sir Samuel Bentham, K.S.G. a brigadier-general in the Russian service, late inspector-general of naval works, and civil architect and engineer of the navy.

*Lately.* At Templemichael, county Longford, lady Anne, wife of the rev. Henry Maxwell, brother to lord Farnham.

In consequence of a fall in ascending one of the Egyptian Pyramids, aged 32, James Maze, esq. eldest son of Peter Maze, esq. of Rownham-lodge, county Somerset, and partner in the house of Messrs. Peter Maze and Sons, merchants, of Bristol.

At Balinagar, Owen O'Connor, esq. commonly called O'Connor Don, M.P. for the county of Roscommon.



## DEATHS.—MAY.

At Genoa, aged 66, Charles Felix Joseph King of Sardinia, duke of Savoy, Piedmont, and Genoa. He was born April 6, 1765, and was the fifth of the six sons of king Victor Amedeus, and the archduchess Maria Antonetta Frederica, daughter of the emperor Joseph the Second. Before his accession to the Throne, he bore the title of duke of Genoa. On the abdication of his brother, king Victor Emmanuel, he was declared sovereign of Sardinia, March 13, 1821, and confirmed on the 19th of the same month. The abdication of Charles Emmanuel, the eldest brother, in 1802, had previously conferred the throne on Victor. Two sisters of this family were the wives of Louis XVIII. and Charles X. of France. King Charles married, April 6, 1807, Maria Christina, daughter of Ferdinand the Fourth, king of the Two Sicilies, and sister of the present monarch of those islands; but had no issue. Charles Amedeus, prince of Savoy Carignan, has succeeded to the throne.

At Kensington-palace, aged 40, Thomas F. Hunt, esq. one of the labourers in trust attached to the Board of Works. He was the author of the following publications, all printed in quarto: "Half-a-dozen Hints on picturesque Domestic Architecture, in a series of designs for gate-houses, game-keepers' cottages, and other rural residences." two editions. "Designs for Parsonage-houses, Alms-houses, &c. &c. with examples of gables and other curious remains of old English architecture, 1827," containing twenty-one plates. "Architettura Campestre; displayed in lodges, gardeners' houses, and other buildings, composed of simple and economical forms, in the modern or Italian style; introducing a picturesque mode of Roofing," with twelve plates. "Exemplars of Tudor Architecture, adapted to modern habitations, with illustrative details selected from ancient edifices, and observations on the Furniture of the Tudor period, 1829," with thirty seven plates. In the literary part of the last-mentioned work, wherein lie its chief interest and utility, he was materially assisted by Mr. T. Moule, author of the "Bibliotheca Heraldica."

At Malta, captain George Matthew Jones, R. N., author of "Travels in Russia and the north-eastern countries of Europe." Captain Jones commenced his naval career under the late sir J.S. Yorke. He received his first commission in 1802,

and was junior lieutenant of the *Amphion* 32 guns, when she conveyed lord Nelson from off Brest to the Mediterranean, on the renewal of hostilities with France, in 1803. On the 8th of Nov. 1808, he was severely wounded in a gallant but unsuccessful boat attack on the coast of Istria. On the 27th of Aug. 1809, he again highly distinguished himself at the capture and destruction of six heavy gun vessels, seven trabacolas, and a land battery of four long twenty-four-pounders, at the mouth of the Piavie, and in sight of the enemy's squadron at Venice. In sir William Hoste's official letter on that occasion, "the prompt manner in which lieut. Jones turned the guns of the battery on the enemy's vessels," was noticed as highly praiseworthy. He afterwards commanded the Tuscan brig, and was employed in co-operation with the defenders of Cadiz, during the siege of *Pisla de Leon*, in the year 1811. His last appointment was, Jan. 23, 1817, to the *Pandora* of eighteen guns, on the Irish station, where he remained for a period of nearly two years. He obtained post rank, Dec. 7, 1818. In 1827, captain Jones published "Travels in Norway, Sweden, Finland, Russia, and Turkey; also on the coast of the Sea of Azof and of the Black Sea, &c. &c." in two vols. 8vo. Previously to these travels, which were undertaken with a view to the acquisition of professional knowledge, he had already inspected all the naval arsenals and ports of France and Holland; and in this publication he relates the result of his examination of them, as well as of those of Russia, Sweden, and Denmark. Shortly after his travels, captain Jones was attacked by a paralysis of the limbs, and repaired to Italy for the recovery of his health. In a state of great debility, he had the misfortune to fall down a flight of steep stone steps at Malta; three of his ribs were broken, and his shoulder dislocated, and on the third day he expired.

## MAY.

1. At Rivoli, on his way to Florence, commander Thomas Bury, R.N.

2. At Bath, aged 64, the right hon. sir William Johnstone Hope, G.C.B. knight of Malta, and of the Crescent, the senior vice-admiral of the Red, a Privy Councillor, a commissioner of Greenwich hospital, and F.R.S. Sir William Hope was born at Finchley, in



## DEATHS.—MAY.

Middlesex, Aug. 16, 1766, and was the third son of John Hope, esq. merchant of London, (grandson of Charles, first earl of Hopetown, and K.T.) by Mary only daughter of Eliab Breton, of Enfield, esq. At the early age of ten years he entered the navy under the patronage of his half-uncle captain Charles Hope; and, after thirty years of hard and varied service he was in 1807 called to the board of Admiralty during the presidency of lord Mulgrave, and sat there until 1809. He was appointed a colonel of Marines, Aug. 1, 1811; a rear-admiral Aug. 12, 1812; commander-in-chief at Leith in Nov. 1813; a K.C.B. Jan. 2, 1815; and re-appointed to the chief command at Leith in the spring of 1816, which he retained until Sept. 1818. In 1819 he was promoted to the rank of vice-adm. In Jan. 1820 he again became a lord of the Admiralty; and when the duke of Clarence was appointed lord high admiral, he retained his seat at the board as one of his royal highness's council. He was created a grand cross of the Bath, Oct. 4, 1825. In March 1828 sir William Hope was appointed by the lord high admiral treasurer of the royal hospital at Greenwich, and thereupon resigned his seat at the Admiralty. On the passing of the act for the better regulation of that noble establishment, by which the office of treasurer was abolished, he was appointed one of the five commissioners for managing the affairs of the institution. Sir W. J. Hope was for thirty years a member of the House of Commons. He was first elected in 1800 for the Dumfries district of Burghs, and in 1804, on the death of general sir Robert Laurie, was chosen for the county of Dumfries, which he continued to represent during six parliaments, until the general election of 1830, when he was succeeded by his son.

3. In Great Ormond-street, in her 64th year, Selina Anne, wife of Zachary Macaulay, esq. and third daughter of the late W. T. Mills, of Bristol.

— At Highgate, near Birmingham, aged 54, William Hamper, esq. F.S.A. honorary member of the Society of Antiquaries at Newcastle, and a Justice of the Peace for the counties of Warwick and Worcester. He was author of a quarto tract printed at Birmingham in 1820, entitled "Observations on certain ancient pillars of memorial called Hoar-stones," and in 1827 of "The Life, Diary, and Correspondence of sir William Dugdale," His communications to

the Society of Antiquaries, of which he became a fellow April 5, 1821, are as follow: in 1817, "Observations on the Seal of Evesham-abbey, in Worcestershire;" in 1818, "Observations on the site of the Priory of Holywell in Warwickshire, a cell to Roucester-abbey in the county of Stafford;" in 1820, "The Runic inscription on the Font at Bridekirk considered, and a new interpretation proposed;" in 1823, "Observations on a gold ring with a Runic inscription, in the possession of the earl of Aberdeen, Pres. S.A.;" "Sarcastic Verses, written by an adherent to the House of Lancaster, in the last year of the reign of Richard the Second;" "Observations on the Arms and Seal of the town of Liverpool;" in 1824, "Explanation of a Runic inscription upon a jasper ring belonging to Mr. Cumberland;" "Account of a Grave in the sand-rock at Lower Stonnall, Staffordshire;" in 1829, "a Disquisition on a passage in king Athelstan's Grant to the abbey of Wilton;" "a Comment on a Penny of Offa king of Mercia;" and in 1830, "a Disquisition on the member in architecture called an Oriel."

4. In his 53rd year, colonel J. Nicol, E.I.C. many years adjutant-general of the Bengal army.

— In Harley-street, aged 68, the right hon. Frances dowager viscountess Nelson, duchess of Bronte. She was the widow of Josiah Nisbet, M.D. when his present majesty performed the ceremony of giving her away in marriage to Nelson, at the island of Nevis, March 22, 1787. Her maiden name was Woolward, and she was niece to William Herbert, esq. president of Nevis.

5. By the upsetting of a boat, adm. sir Joseph Sydney Yorke, captain Bradby, R.N., and captain Young, R.N.

6. At Bishop's Stortford, lieut.-col. W. H. Wilby.

7. Aged 53, at Welling, lieut.-col. G. Bunce.

11. M. Anbert du Petit Thouars, member of the Institute; of the Royal Agricultural, Horticultural, and Philomathic Societies of Paris; and knight of the order of St. Louis. This gentleman, born in 1756, at the chateau of Boumois, in Anjou, was educated at the college of La Fleche. At the age of sixteen he entered the regiment de la Couronne, as a sous-lieutenant; but it was his taste for natural philosophy, and especially for botany, which raised him to the high degree of consideration he enjoyed in



## DEATHS.—MAY.

the capital of France. A brother of M. du Petit-Thouars held the rank of captain in the French navy; he was killed at the battle of Aboukir. The brothers had formed, in 1792, the project of a voyage of discovery, one particular object of which was to seek after La Perouse; they had sold a considerable part of their property to defray the expenses of the undertaking; and M. du Petit Thouars set out on foot, for Brest, to join the vessel fitted out for that purpose: his zeal for botanical research inducing him to walk through a country which he had not yet seen. As he pursued his course, deviating at times into the woods and fields, to look after new descriptions of plants, he was assailed by the commencement of those horrors which the revolution brought upon France. Being arrested as a *suspect*, he was conducted to Quimper, where he remained a considerable time in prison. On reaching Brest, he found that his brother had sailed. He followed him to the Isle of France, but was too late to rejoin him. As his means did not permit him to hire another vessel, he remained ten years in that colony, and was occupied with cultivation and botany, during the whole period, excepting a few months that he passed in Madagascar. M. du Petit Thouars returned to France in 1802, and for above twenty years was director of the *Pépinière Royale du Roule*. He has published the following works: "*Mélanges de Botanique*;" "*Dialogues sur l'Histoire Naturelle*;" "*Essai sur la Végétation*;" and researches on the "*Orchides*;" besides which he has given public lectures on botany, and devoted the leisure of ten years to an unfinished work on the plants of the southern African islands.

13. In consequence of injuries received at the Wigan election, Roger Holt Leigh, esq. of Leeds, brother to sir Robert Holt Leigh, of Hindley-hall, near Wigan, bart.

— M. Armand Louis Maurice Seignier, the French consul general in London, a Chevalier of St. Louis, and commander of the legion of honour. He wrote several small dramatic pieces, performed at the theatre des Vaudevilles, which were extremely popular.

14. In Bedford-square, in his 68th year, Jonathan Raine, esq. M.P. Mr. Raine was a king's counsel, and a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, and a fortnight prior to his dissolution he was returned for the duke of Northumberland's borough of

Newport (Cornwall), which he had represented since 1812. In 1816, Mr. Raine was appointed one of the Welsh judges, and he continued to discharge the functions of that judicial office until the recent alterations in the judicature of the Principality, when he retired on the superannuation allowance of 1,000*l.* per annum.

15. Aged 53, Joseph Brookhouse, esq. of Warwick. He was a native of Leicester; and having early entered into the army, served during the American war. After his return he settled at Leicester, and was the first to introduce machinery for spinning worsted in the hosiery manufactories. This invention exposed him at first to the mistaken ill-will of the working classes; in consequence of which he removed to Birmingham, then to Bromsgrove, and finally to Warwick. There he successfully conducted for many years the worsted manufactory, established in 1796, under the firm of Parkes, Brookhouse, and Crompton.

18. Aged 62, the right hon. John Vaughan, third earl of Lisburne (1776) sixth visct. Lisburne and baron Vaughan of Fethers (1695); a colonel in the army.

— The rev. Henry Francis Alexander Delafite, M.A. evening lecturer at St. Paul's, Covent Garden (for nearly thirty years), and foreign secretary to the Royal society of Literature. Having lived on terms of strict intimacy with the late illustrious geologist, De Luc, during the latter years of that eminent man's life, he, in the year 1812, published, under the eye of the author, a translation of De Luc's "*Elements of Geology*." He had just completed at the time of his decease, a new edition of De Luc's "*Letters on the Physical History of the Earth*;" to which he had prefixed an introduction, containing a general view and vindication of the labours of that great geologist.

23. At Crawley, Hants, in his 40th year, the rev. Henry Thomas Dampier, rector of that parish, vicar of Westwratting, Cambridgeshire, and prebendary of Ely. He was the eldest son of the late sir Henry Dampier, judge of the King's Bench.

24. At Jarrow, in her 107th year, Margaret Fenwick, she retained her faculties unimpaired to the last. From the township of Westgate, she had received, during the period of 57 years, not less than 450*l.*



## DEATHS.—MAY.

25. At Watford, in his 59th year, Robert Clutterbuck, esq. B.A. F.S.A. a deputy lieutenant and magistrate for Hertfordshire, and author of the History of that county. Mr. Clutterbuck was born at Watford, June 28, 1772. At an early age he was sent to Harrow-school; and he continued there until he was entered as a gentleman commoner of Exeter college, Oxford. He subsequently took the degree of B.A.; and was then entered at Lincoln's Inn, intending to make the law his profession; but his ardour in the pursuit of chemistry, and in painting (in which he took lessons of Barry) induced him, after a residence of several years in London, to abandon his original plans. In the year 1798 he married Marianne the eldest daughter of colonel James Capper, of the hon. East India Company's service; and, after a few years residence at the seat of his father-in-law, Cathays, near Cardiff in Glamorganshire, he took possession of his paternal estate at Watford, where he continued to reside until his death. He employed his leisure in collecting materials for a new edition of Chauncy's History of Hertfordshire. But finding his manuscripts greatly accumulated, and having purchased in 1811 the genealogical collections for Hertfordshire, made by the late Thomas Blore, esq. F.S.A. he formed the resolution of publishing a completely new History of his native County, making such use only of Chauncy's materials as were to his purpose. In this object he steadily persevered for eighteen years, and the result was an elegant and complete History, in three folio volumes.

26. In his 77th year, Charles Rivington, esq. of Waterloo-place, and Brunswick-square, the senior member of the firm of Messrs. Rivingtons, booksellers of St. Paul's Church-yard and Waterloo-place.

27. At Gatcombe-park, in his 6th year, the only son of David Ricardo, esq. He was taking his usual exercise in the park, with a servant attending him, when the pony on which he was riding suddenly turned round in the direction of the stable, and threw him with such violence on his head as to occasion his death in two hours afterwards.

— At Berlin, Christian Adam Gaspari, professor of Geography and Statistics in the University of Königsberg. He was born in 1752, and was author of many works on Geography. &c.

— At Aghneverna, co. Louth, aged 62, the hon. baron M<sup>r</sup> Clelland, upwards

of thirty years a judge of the court of Exchequer.

— At Pilton, aged 67, Richard Pellowe, esq., a post captain R. N.

28. At Paris, the celebrated M. Gregoire, formerly bishop of Blois, and member of the National Convention.

— In Albemarle-street, after a short but severe illness, aged 73, the right hon. William Carnegie, seventh earl of Northesk and lord Rosehill, in the peerage of Scotland; an admiral of the Red, rear-admiral of Great Britain, G. C. B., K. C., L. L. D., and governor of the British Linen Company's Bank. His lordship was descended from an ancient family, which had been settled for several centuries in the county of Angus, North Britain. In the reign of Charles the First, the eldest of four brothers was created earl of Southesk, and lord Carnegie, and the second was advanced to the dignities of lord Inglismaldie, lord Lour, and earl of Ethie, which two latter titles he afterwards exchanged for those of earl of Northesk and lord Rosehill. In consequence of the attachment of this family to that unfortunate prince, they were fined by Oliver Cromwell 10,000*l*. They were afterwards equally remarkable for their support of the Revolution, and for their steady loyalty to the House of Hanover. In the Rebellion of 1715, when the family mansion was taken possession of by the old pretender, the countess of Northesk was obliged to seek refuge in the castle of Edinburgh, where she was delivered of the late earl's father, George, earl of Northesk, so named after George the First. He died in 1792, having served with a considerable degree of credit in the royal navy, and having attained the rank of admiral of the White. The late earl, the third son of the preceding, by lady Ann Leslie, daughter of the earl of Leven, and Melville, was born in 1758. At the age of eleven he embarked with captain the hon. Samuel Barrington, in the Albion. He next served with captain Macbride in the Southampton, at the time he conveyed the queen of Denmark to Zell; after being made acting lieutenant in the Nonsuch, and confirmed by lord Howe in 1777 into the Apollo, he served with sir John Lockhart Ross in the Royal George at the capture of the Caracca fleet off Cape Finisterre, and at the relief of Gibraltar; then in the West Indies with lord Rodney, who promoted him from the Flag ship after the action of the 17th of April, 1780, to be com-



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

mander of the *Blast* fire ship. In 1788 he succeeded his elder brother, as lord Rosehill, and on the equipment of the Russian armament was appointed to the *Heroine* thirty-two gun frigate, but was paid off soon after. In 1792 on the demise of his father he succeeded to the title and estate, and in January of the following year proceeded to the West Indies in command of the *Beaulieu* frigate, and returned with convoy in the *Andromeda*, which was shortly after put out of commission. He remained unemployed until 1796, when he joined the North Sea fleet under lord Duncan, and in 1800 was appointed to the *Prince* of ninety-eight guns in the Channel fleet under the command of his illustrious relative the earl of St. Vincent, in which ship he continued till the peace in 1802, when he again retired from active service, and the same year was re-elected one of the sixteen peers of Scotland. On the renewal of hostilities with the French Republic in 1803 his lordship was amongst the foremost to offer his services, and was immediately appointed to his majesty's ship *Britannia* of 100 guns. In her he served in the Channel under the command of admiral Cornwallis till May 1804, when he was promoted to the rank of rear-admiral of the White. In the following month he hoisted his flag in the same ship, and continued to serve in her on her former station in the arduous blockade of Brest during the trying and tempestuous winter of 1804, and till August in the following year, when he was detached with a squadron under the orders of vice-admiral sir Robert Calder to reinforce vice-admiral Collingwood off Cadiz. In the battle of Trafalgar the *Britannia* bore his lordship's flag, and took a distinguished part in achieving the victory. For his brilliant services on this occasion lord Northesk was created a knight of the Bath, and received the thanks of both Houses of Parliament; the freedom of the city of London, and of the Goldsmith's Company, with a sword of the value of 100 guineas from the city of London, an admiral's medal from his majesty to be worn round the neck, and a vase of the value of 300*l.* from the Patriotic Fund at Lloyd's were voted to him. On the death of admiral sir William Young, 21st of Nov. 1821, the earl of Northesk was appointed rear-admiral of Great Britain, and in May 1827, he was appointed commander-in-chief at Ply-

mouth where he remained until 1830, when the period allowed for the command expired. The funeral of this brave and distinguished nobleman took place in St. Paul's Cathedral, 8th of June.

29. At Warwick, aged 87, the rev. John Clowes, rector of St. John's church Manchester,

30. At the Rectory, Hambleden, Bucks, aged 17, Letitia-Matilda, youngest dau. of the rev. H. Colborne Ridley.

31. At Welford-park, aged 57, John Archer Houlton, esq. formerly M. P. for Essex. He was returned, after a contest with Montagu Burgoyne, esq. It continued during 15 days, in which Mr. Houlton polled 2519 and Mr. Burgoyne 811 votes.

*Latelly.* At Kourdefan, in Abyssinia, capt. Woodfall who had been sent by the African society to penetrate into Africa through Abyssinia.

Near Rome, in her 32nd year, the right hon. Mary-Lucy lady Clifford. She was the only dau. of Thomas Weld, of Lulworth Castle, in Dorsetshire, esq. (now a Cardinal of the church of Rome) by Lucy dau. of the hon. Thos. Clifford; was married to her second cousin, the present lord, Aug. 31, 1818.

In Scotland, Brigadier-general Alexander Walker, of the East India Company's Bombay establishment, late governor of St. Helena.

At his seat, Haverholme Priory, near Newark, in his 85th year, sir Jenison William Gordon, bart. He died without issue, and the title becomes extinct, the earl of Winchilsea succeeding to his extensive estates.

## JUNE.

1. At his house, St. John's Wood, aged 53, John Jackson, esq. R. A. the eminent portrait painter. This distinguished artist was born at Lavingham, a small village in the North Riding of Yorkshire, May 31, 1778. His father was the village tailor, and he himself commenced his career in that unambitious occupation. He had from his childhood a predilection for drawing; and by the time he left school, had (by the assistance of his master) made greater proficiency than the slender means he possessed appeared to warrant. In 1797, at nineteen years of age, he ventured to offer himself as a painter of portraits in miniature, at York; and during one of



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

his itinerant excursions to Whitby, had the honour of an introduction to lord Mulgrave, by whom he was patronized, and recommended to the notice of the earl of Carlisle. At Castle Howard he had the great advantage of studying a magnificent collection of pictures; and he copied the three Marys, by Annibal Carracci, with considerable success. He had likewise the good fortune to meet with another patron in the late sir George Beaumont, who, as the first trial of his abilities, lent him a picture of the younger Colman by sir Joshua Reynolds, of which he made a most faithful copy. In 1804 he came to London, and in the following year became a student at the Royal Academy, sir George Beaumont contributing principally to his support. In 1807 he was established as a portrait painter; and every succeeding year furnished specimens of his abilities for the Exhibition at Somerset House. Although, from the field being occupied by artists of longer standing, it was long before he obtained much employment as a painter in oil, his portraits in water colours soon became very much admired. In 1816 he was elected an associate of the Royal Academy, and in 1818 a Royal Academician. In the former year he accompanied general the hon. Edmund Phipps in a tour through Holland and Flanders; and in 1819, in company with Mr. Chantrey the sculptor, he made the tour of Italy, by way of Geneva, Milan, Padua, Venice, Bologna, Florence, and Rome. At the latter city he was associated a member of the Academy of St. Luke, and met with great attention from Canova, who sat to him for his portrait: the picture is now in the possession of Mr. Chantrey, and engraved in the European Magazine for Nov. 1822. One of his last exhibition pictures was a portrait of his intimate friend Chantrey, which he painted last year for sir Robert Peel. As a portrait painter Mr. Jackson may be ranked between the elegant detail of Lawrence, and the vigorous generalities of Raeburn. He had an uncommon readiness and skill of hand; his colouring was deep, clear, and splendid, and in this he resembled Reynolds more than any artist since his day.

1. In Newman-street, at an advanced age, Mather Brown, esq. This gentleman was a native of America, and coming to England when a young man, became a pupil of his countryman Mr. West. He was employed by Boydell to paint

Gallery, and was afterwards honoured by being commissioned to paint portraits of their majesties, and others of the Royal Family. Towards the latter end of the last century he enjoyed considerable practice as a portrait painter, and for several years occupied a spacious house in Cavendish-square, which had been previously tenanted by Romney. He also painted the historical pictures from which were engraved some of the most popular prints, particularly the marquis Cornwallis receiving the sons of Tippoo Saib as hostages. These productions had sufficient merit for public sale; but not to place Mr. Brown in a very high rank in his profession. A picture of the Resurrection, which he painted late in life, was considered one of his best productions.

2. At Paris, the Nestor of French literature, Felix Nogaret, born at Versailles in 1740. He was known by the name of the French Aristenetus, and his last production was a pamphlet, half in prose and half in verse, intitled, "Aristenete à M. Noiret;" it is dated Jan. 1831.

— At York, Charles Otter, esq. a post captain R.N.

3. At Reading, Stephen Maberly, esq., father of J. Maberly, esq. M.P. for Abingdon.

— At Sidney-lodge, Cambridge, after many months of acute suffering, Mary, wife of the rev. Dr. Chafy, master of Sidney Sussex College.

4. In Gloucester-place, aged 28, Thomas Percy Meade, M.A. Fellow of All Souls' College, Oxford, second son of the hon. and rev. Pierce Meade, by Elizabeth, daughter of the late Dr. Percy, bishop of Dromore.

8. In Upper Baker-street, aged 75, Mrs. Sarah Siddons, the celebrated actress. This highly talented lady was born at Brecknock, and was the eldest daughter of Mr. Roger Kemble, the manager of an itinerant company of comedians. She made her first essay as a singer, but soon abandoned that line and attempted tragedy. Early in life she conceived a passion for Mr. Siddons, in which not being indulged by her parents, she quitted the stage, and engaged herself as lady's maid in the family of Mrs. Greatheed, of Guy's-Cliff, near Warwick, where she remained about a year; and then resolving to unite herself with the man of her affections, she was married to Mr. Siddons, and soon after joined a strolling company of no great



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

reputation. Both she and her husband had, however, the good fortune to be engaged by Mr. Younger, to perform at Liverpool, Birmingham, &c.; with him she remained a few years, and acquired a celebrity which procured her an engagement at Drury-lane. The following is a description of her first appearance as Portia, Dec. 29, 1775:—"On before us tottered, rather than walked, a very pretty, delicate, fragile looking young creature, dressed in a most unbecoming manner, a faded salmon-coloured sack and coat, and uncertain whereabouts to fix either her eyes or her feet. She spoke in a broken tremulous tone, and, at the close of a sentence, her words generally lapsed into a hurried whisper that was absolutely inaudible. After her first exit the buzzing comment round the pit ran generally, "She is certainly very pretty, but then how awkward! and what a shocking dresser!" Towards the famous trial scene she became more collected, and delivered the great speech to Shylock with the most critical propriety, but still with a faintness of utterance which seemed the result rather of an internal physical weakness than a deficiency of spirit or feeling. Altogether, the impression made upon the audience by this first effort was of the most negative description."—She was at that time considered merely as a second-rate actress; and being unfortunately placed in an unsuccessful after-piece written by the editor of a newspaper, who omitted no opportunity of injuring her reputation, she quitted the London boards for a time, to return to them afterwards with increased lustre. At Bath, whither she repaired, she was observed to improve rapidly, and is said to have been usefully assisted by the lessons of Mr. Pratt, then a bookseller in that city. She had also the good fortune to be patronized by the duchess of Devonshire, who procured her another engagement at Drury Lane. Before she quitted Bath she spoke a farewell address, which she herself had written. Mrs. Siddons made her second appearance at Drury-lane on the 10th Oct. 1782, in the character of Isabella. Her fame was soon spread abroad, and the theatre overflowed every night. Her success was the means of introducing her sister, Miss F. Kemble, on the same stage; who played Alicia, to her sister's Jane Shore, but shortly after retired, on her marriage with Mr. Twiss, a literary gentleman, and a well known traveller. In

the summer she visited Dublin, the inhabitants of which were equally astonished at her powers. On her return for the winter (1783-4,) she performed for the first time "By command of their majesties." During the succeeding summer she took a second trip to Ireland, and also visited Edinburgh: in both places she not only received great salaries but very considerable presents. Envy and malice as usual, pursued merit; and to these alone can be attributed the attack made on her in a newspaper, respecting her treatment of an unhappy sister, &c. These reports, however, had such an effect upon the town, that on her first appearance on the stage in 1784, she was saluted with the cry of, "Off! off!" Her friends at length obtained her a hearing; and her husband and brother succeeded in refuting the calumnies to which she had been exposed. She was accordingly restored to public favour. Their majesties at this time paid her much attention. Her talent in reciting dramatic works had been highly spoken of, which reaching the ears of the Royal family, she was frequently invited to Buckingham-house and Windsor, where she and her brother often recited plays: When some relaxation, on account of her health, was considered necessary, she quitted Drury-lane for a time, and performed at Weymouth, Plymouth, Liverpool, &c. with additional reputation. She also visited several of her noble patrons, amongst whom lord and lady Harcourt stood conspicuous. The remains of Mrs. Siddons were interred at Paddington church on the 15th of June. The funeral procession consisted of a hearse, drawn by four horses followed by two mourning coaches and four, containing the relatives of the deceased; afterwards fourteen mourning coaches drawn by two horses, each containing four gentlemen belonging to the theatres; two gentlemen's carriages brought up the procession. The number of persons assembled to witness the funeral could not be less than 5000. Mrs. Siddons's son died at Edinburgh, where he was manager of the theatre, April 12, 1815. She had also two daughters, one of whom died at the time she was engaged to marry the late sir Thomas Lawrence,

— At his house in Berkeley-square, aged 70, sir John Edward Harrington, the eighth baronet, of Ridlington, co. Rutland.

9. At Madras, lieut. col. John Tayn-



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

ton, of the hon. East India Company's establishment.

10. At his head-quarters, Kleczewo, near Pultusk, of cholera morbus, aged 46, field-marshal count Diebitsch Sabalkansky. This celebrated general was descended from an ancient Silesian family, and was born May 13, 1785. In his earliest years, it is said, he had so singularly retentive a memory, that, when he had attained his fourth year, he was capable of resolving arithmetical questions with greater readiness than most adults. The count's father was an officer of distinguished talent, whom Frederick the Great, a short time before his death, appointed on his personal staff as extra adjutant. After Frederick's demise, he occupied the post of garrison-major at Breslau; and when holding this post, was one day agreeably surprised by receiving a ministerial dispatch, addressed to "lieut. col. von Diebitsch." In his delight at this unexpected honour, he spread the tidings instantly among his comrades, and solicited his commander to make it public on the day's parade; the request was refused, because his superior had received no official intimation of his promotion; and, it turned out that the whole arose out of a blunder on the part of the office-clerk who had directed the dispatch. Major Diebitsch, deeming that he had compromised his character with the government, sent in his resignation, left his son to complete his education in the Academy for cadets at Berlin, and entered the service of Russia. He was immediately intrusted with an important command; and his son having received an officer's commission in the Russian guards, he wrote to Frederick William II. requesting his sanction to the transfer of his own services; but at the same time insisting that as his child had been educated in a Prussian military school, the services of that child should be devoted to the Prussian state. Frederick, however, refused to shackle his sanction with any such stipulation; and the consequence was, that the late field-marshal enlisted under Russian banners. His stratagetic acquirements, as far as regards theory, were perfected in the military school at St. Petersburg. He rose rapidly from the guards to an appointment on the staff: though young in years, his talent was so eminent as to entitle him to the grades of lieut.-general and quartermaster-gene-

ral in the campaigns of 1813 and 1814: and he became subsequently Adjutant-general to the late emperor, whose confidence in him descended to his successor Nicholas. In the conflict at Austerlitz he was wounded by a spent ball, which lodged in the palm of his hand. He also distinguished himself in the actions of Eylau and Friedland, and in the celebrated campaign of 1812. At Dresden he received a severe contusion, and had two horses killed under him. The appointment of count Diebitsch to the supreme command of the Russian army, at the commencement of the campaign against Turkey in 1829, was the exclusive act of the emperor. The nomination excited considerable discontent in the first instance, because the person selected was not a native Russian. The operations of the campaign and its result show that the choice of the emperor was not misplaced. The emperor made the field-marshal a count, with the title of Sabalkansky, or the Traverser of the Balkan; and on the 12th of Sept. 1829, sent him the order of St. George of the 1st class. Thus possessing the entire confidence of Nicholas, he was selected, on the breaking out of the Polish revolution, to restore the Russian dominion in that country. On the morning of May 28 (June 9,) the field-marshal had felt himself unwell, but during the day he eat and seemed in good spirits as usual. In the evening he went to bed at 10 o'clock, was soon called up to attend to some business, and still appeared quite well. About two o'clock in the morning he suddenly felt indisposed, and called to his attendants, but it was not till past three o'clock that, finding himself grow worse, he ordered the physician to be called. The symptoms of cholera soon became very violent, and after severe sufferings terminated in death at a quarter past 11 in the morning. In person, Diebitsch was short, brown, and walked with his head down: he appeared cold, but his eye was fiery, and continually occupied; his forehead was high, like that of Napoleon, and his back bent somewhat crooked. He was married, in 1815, to Jane, baroness de Tornau, niece to the lady of prince Barclay de Tolly. The marshall when dying expressed a wish that his remains should be buried in Silesia.

10. Aged 56, the right hon. lady Mary York, wife of Richard York, esq. of Wighill-park, near Tadcaster, daugh-



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

ter of the late, and sister of the present earl of Harewood.

11. At Clifton, aged 69, lieut. col. Hennessy, E. I. C.

12. At Ivy Cottage in the Isle of Portland, baron Gustavus Nolcken, eldest surviving son of baron Nolcken formerly Swedish ambassador to this country.

13. At Clifton, aged 47, Eliza, wife of general sir Hussey Vivian, bart. G.C.B., and commander-in-chief of the forces in Ireland.

15. At Chelsea, aged 111, Patrick Gibson. He was a purser in the navy, superannuated after he had passed his hundredth year. Gibson was an Irishman, and of a very strong sinewy frame.

— In Wimpole-street, aged 80, gen. William Loftus, col. of the second Dragoon Guards, and lieut. governor of the Tower of London.

— At Hillingdon, aged 81, lady Katherine Walpole, aunt to the earl of Orford, dau. of Horatio the first earl, by lady Rachael Cavendish, third dau. of William, third duke of Devonshire.

16. At his seat, Woodend, Hampshire. after a very short illness, aged 83, sir John Knight, K. C. B., admiral of the Red.

— At the Manor house, High Beach, Essex, aged 72, Thomas Sotheby, esq. admiral of the White.

18. At his seat, Yotes Court, Kent, aged 63, the right hon. George Byng, sixth viscount Torrington, in Devonshire, and baron Byng of Southill in Bedfordshire, a baronet, vice-admiral of the white, D.C.L. and F.R.S.

20. At Montröse, aged 90, Mrs. Margaret Rose, sister of the late right hon. sir G. Rose, treasurer of the navy.

23. At his house, in Arlington-street, Piccadilly, aged 84, the right hon. lord Robert Spencer, uncle to the duke of Marlborough and lord Churchill.

24. Aged 73, Anna, widow of Robert (who but for the attainder would have been the 12th) lord Trimlestown, of Trimlestown Castle, Dublin, cousin of the present Peer.

— In James-street, Buckingham-gate, colonel sir Ralph Hamilton, knight, of Olivestob, N.B. groom of the bed-chamber to the duke of Gloucester.

— At Mentz, aged 64, count Ferdinand de Hompesch, lieutenant-general in the British service.

— At Margate, aged 60, G. Crookshank, esq. eldest son of the late right hon. A. Crookshank, of Newton-park, near Dublin.

26. Sir Murray Maxwell, knight, and C.B. a post captain in the royal navy, and F.R.S.; first cousin to sir William Maxwell, of Calderwood, county Lanark, bart., and to Jane late Duchess of Gordon. This distinguished officer was a son of Alexander Maxwell, esq. merchant at Leith, (third son of sir William Maxwell, the fourth baronet), by Mary, daughter of Hugh Clerk, esq. He commenced his naval career under the auspices of sir Samuel Hood; obtained his first commission as a lieutenant in 1796, and was promoted to the command of the *Cyane* sloop of war, at the Leeward islands, in Dec. 1802. His post commission was confirmed by the admiralty, Aug. 4, 1803. In Oct. 1815 he was appointed to the *Alceste*, at the particular request of lord Amherst, who was about to proceed on his celebrated embassy to China. The *Alceste* sailed from Spithead, Feb. 9, 1816; and landed lord Amherst on the 9th of August at the mouth of the *Peiho* river. As it was certain that it would be several months before his lordship could return from Peking to Canton, the interval was employed in surveying the coasts of that part of the globe. In the course of this cruise, very considerable accessions were made to the knowledge of the hydrographer. In particular, the main land of Corea was found more than a hundred miles to the eastward of the spot laid down in the charts. Lord Amherst having embarked at Whampoa on the 21st of Jan. 1817, the *Alceste* had proceeded as far as the Straits of Gaspar, every circumstance promising a speedy passage into the Java sea, when, on the 18th of February she struck on a sunken and unknown rock, three miles distant from Pulo Leat. A landing having been effected on that barren island, it was judged expedient that lord Amherst and his suite should proceed immediately to Batavia, a distance of 200 miles. This was happily effected, by his lordship and a company of forty-six individuals, in the barge and a cutter, after a passage of four nights and three days, in which great privations were suffered from the scarcity of provisions and water. On the following morning the Company's cruiser *Ternate* was dispatched to captain Maxwell and the remaining crew; but, in consequence of contrary currents, she was not able to join them until a fortnight had elapsed from the time they were first left by lord Amherst. In the mean time their situation had



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

attracted the notice of the Malay proas, or pirate boats, who had burnt the wreck to the water's edge; and now completely blockaded the shipwrecked crew. Before the approach of the Ternate, this swarm of hornets had increased to no less than sixty in number, each containing from eight to twelve men; but immediately on the appearance of that vessel, they took to a precipitate flight. For some days captain Maxwell had been actively employed in fortifying a hill, and providing his party with ammunition. The Ternate sailed on the 7th of April with the rescued crew, and reached Batavia on the 9th; and three days after, the embassy and crew of the Alceste sailed together for England in the ship Cæsar. Captain Maxwell was nominated a C.B. in 1815, and received the honour of knighthood May 27, 1818. At the general election in the same year he was a candidate for the city of Westminster, and sustained severe personal injury from the rabble. On the 20th of May, 1819, the East-India Company presented him with the sum of 1,500*l.* for the services rendered by him to the embassy, and as a remuneration for the loss he sustained on his return from China. He was appointed to the Bulwark, a third-rate, bearing the flag of sir Benjamin Hallowell, at Chatham, in June 1821; was removed to the Briton frigate on the 28th of Nov. 1822, and afterwards employed on the South American station. He had been recently appointed on the 11th of May, lieutenant-governor of Prince Edward's Island; and was preparing to take his departure, when a very short illness terminated his life.

26, At Roehampton, aged 30, lord Arthur Augustus Edwin Hill, brother to the marquis of Downshire.

27. At Witepsk, of the cholera morbus, aged 52, his imperial highness the archduke Constantine of Russia, the late viceroy of Poland. He was born May 9, 1779, and was the second son of the emperor Paul, and the empress Maria Feodowna, before marriage the princess Sophia Dorothea Augusta of Wurtemberg. When not yet seventeen, Constantine was married Feb. 26, 1796, to Julia Henrietta Ulrica, daughter of Francis duke of Saxe Coburg-Saalfeld, and sister to the present reigning duke of Saxe Coburg. This marriage was dissolved by an imperial ukase of April 2, 1820; and the grand duke was married again, on the 20th of May

following, to Jane, by birth countess Grudzinska, and created princess of Lowicz.

28. The right hon. Elizabeth countess of Eldon, eldest daughter of Aubone Surtees, esq. of Newcastle.

— In Queen Ann-street, aged 74, sir Francis John Hartwell, knight and baronet, of Dale Hall, in Essex, a retired captain in the royal navy.

— At Cheyne Walk, Chelsea, aged 58, the rev. Weeden Butler, M. A. rector of Great Woolston, Bucks, and minister of Brompton Chapel, Middlesex. He was the author of "*Bagatelles, consisting of original Poetry and Translations,*" 1795, 8vo; and also translated "*Prospect of the political relations which subsist between the French Republic and the Helvetic body, from the French of Weiss,*" 1794, 8vo.; "*The Wrongs of Unterwalden,*" 1799; "*Zimao, the African,*" 1800, and 1807.

30. At Toxteth Park, Liverpool, aged 80, William Roscoe, esq. a royal associate of the Royal Society of Literature, and F.L.S. Mr. Roscoe was born at Liverpool, of obscure parentage. His father and mother were both in the service of a bachelor, with whose consent they married, and who, dying without an heir, left the greater part, if not the whole of his property, to them. It does not appear that his patron paid any attention to his early education, and his father had no higher ambition than to make him acquainted with writing and arithmetic. Through an obstinacy of temper, which in some minds is the forerunner of genius, Roscoe could not be prevailed upon to submit to the drudgery of scholastic discipline; and consequently did not properly avail himself even of the small advantages of education which his parents were able to afford him. It was, however, his merit to discover in time the means of self-education. He early began to think for himself. At the age of sixteen his poetical productions would have done credit to one who had enjoyed the advantages of tuition; and he was at that time found sufficiently qualified to be admitted as an articled clerk to Mr. Eyes, a respectable attorney in Liverpool. While engaged in the duties of the office, and fulfilling them to the satisfaction of his superior, he found means, by his own unassisted efforts, to acquire a knowledge of Latin; and afterwards of French and Italian. After the expiration of his articles, he entered into partnership with Mr. Aspinall;



## DEATHS.—JUNE.

when the entire management of an office, extensive in practice, and high in reputation, devolved on him alone. About this time he formed an intimacy with Dr. Enfield, the tutor of the academy at Warrington, to whom, on the publication of the second volume of that popular work "The Speaker," he contributed an Elegy to Pity, and an Ode to Education. Mr. Roscoe also became acquainted with Dr. Aikin another resident at Warrington. In December 1773, he recited before the society formed at Liverpool for the encouragement of drawing, painting, &c. an ode which was afterwards published with "Mount Pleasant," his first poetical production, originally written when in his sixteenth year. He occasionally gave lectures on subjects connected with the objects of this institution, and was a very active member of the society. In 1788, Mr. Roscoe published a work upon the Slave Trade, entitled "A Scriptural Refutation of a pamphlet lately published by the rev. Raymond Harris;" and shortly afterwards his principal poem, "The Wrongs of Africa." Incited by the enthusiasm of the same train of feeling, he composed, about the commencement of the French Revolution, two ballads, "The Vine-covered Hills," and "Millions be Free!" The great work on which Mr. Roscoe's fame chiefly rests, his "Life of Lorenzo de' Medici," was commenced in 1790, and completed in 1796. During the period of its compilation, the author lived at the distance of two miles from Liverpool, whither he daily repaired to attend to the business of his office. His evenings alone could be dedicated to the work; the rare books which he had occasion to consult, were mostly procured from London, although it was a considerable advantage to him that his friend, Mr. Clarke, the banker, had spent a winter at Florence. The work was printed at Liverpool, under his own superintendence. In 1798, Mr. Roscoe published "The Nurse, a Poem, from the Italian of Luigi Tansillo," in 4to. 8vo. 1800. In 1805 appeared his second great work, "The Life and Pontificate of Leo the Tenth," the son of Lorenza de' Medici, in 4 vols. 4to., the 8vo. edition, in six volumes, 1806. After the publication of his first historical work, Mr. Roscoe had retired from his practice as a solicitor, and had entered himself at Gray's Inn, with the intention of practising at the bar. In 1805, however,

he was induced to join the banking-house of his friends Messrs. Clarke; and in the following year he was elected one of the members for his native town in parliament. His senatorial career was brief; but during its continuance he distinguished himself as a steadfast advocate of the principles he had always professed, and as a warm partizan of the cause of emancipation throughout the debates upon the Slave Trade. After the dissolution, in 1807, he declined entering upon a new contest, and from that time interfered with politics only by means of occasional pamphlets. The titles of the principal of these are as follow:—Remarks on the Proposals made to Great Britain for a negotiation with France, 1808; Considerations on the Causes of the present War, 1808; Observations on the Address to his Majesty, proposed by earl Grey, 1810; Occasional Tracts relative to the War betwixt France and Great Britain, 1811; Letter to Henry Brougham, esq. on a Reform in the Representation of the People in Parliament, 1811; Answer to a Letter from Mr. J. Merritt, on Parliamentary Reform, 1812; Observations on Penal Jurisprudence and the Reformation of Criminals, 1819. Mr. Roscoe evinced his attachment to botany by "An Address delivered before the Proprietors of the Botanic Garden at Liverpool, previous to the opening the Garden, May 3, 1802," published in 12mo. and by the following communications to the Transactions of the Linnæan Society: in 1806, Of the Plants of the Monandrian Class, usually called Scitamineæ (vol. viii. p. 330); in 1810, An artificial and natural arrangement of Plants, and particularly on the systems of Linnæus and Jussieu (vol. xi. p. 50); in 1814, On Dr. Roxburgh's description of the Monandrous Plants (ibid. p. 270).

Mr. Roscoe also wrote the preface to Daulby's Catalogue of the Etchings of Rembrandt; and the descriptions to the Italian Views in Prout's Landscape Annual. While Mr. Roscoe was occupied with his literary and political studies, a series of unforeseen circumstances, particularly several other failures, obliged the banking-house in which he was engaged to suspend payment. Time was given for the firm to recover from its embarrassments. The difficulties, however, in which it was placed, rendered it impossible for the partners to make good their engagements. Mr. Roscoe did all that



## DEATHS.—JULY.

could be expected from an honest man; he gave up the whole of his property to satisfy his creditors. His library, which was very extensive, and consisted principally of Italian works, was the greatest sacrifice; the books were sold (at Liverpool) for 5150*l.*, the prints for 1880*l.*, and the drawings for 738*l.* A portrait of Leo the Tenth was purchased for 500*l.* by Mr. Coke of Holkham. Yet, upon the whole, Mr. Roscoe, could scarcely be termed unfortunate. Distinguished through life by the friendship of the gifted and noble, his days were spent in a free intercourse with kindred minds, and his declining years were solaced by the affectionate attentions of sincerely attached relations. He was regarded as the head of the literary and scientific circles of his native town; and much of his time was spent in the promotion of public institutions which he had contributed to establish. His funeral was attended by committees of the Royal Institution, the Philosophical Society, and the Athenæum; and by nearly two hundred gentlemen on foot, besides those in carriages.

*Lately.* At Dublin, lieutenant-colonel William I. Tucker, late of the Royal Irish Artillery.

— In Albemarle-street, aged 58, sir John Hayford Thorold, the tenth bart. of Marston, county Lincoln (1642), capt. in the 3rd York Militia.

— In Welbeck-street, Robert Fullerton, esq. late governor of Prince of Wales's Island, Singapore, and Malacca.

— At Stanborough-house, Somersetshire, aged 65, major-gen. John Hilly Symons, late of the East India Company's Madras Establishment.

— At Donaghadee, aged 76, the right hon. Harriet countess of Massareene, relict of Chichester earl of Massareene, and aunt to the earl of Roden.

## JULY.

2. In Windsor Castle, aged 72, col. James M'Dermott, late of the Royal Military College.

— At Southampton, George Argles, esq. a post captain R.N. having been for some time in a desponding state of mind, heclosed his existence, during the temporary absence of his wife, by discharging a pistol in his mouth, and stabbing

himself in the left side with a carving knife.

2. At his seat, Merton Abbey, Surry, aged 78, Isaac Smith, esq. a superannuated rear-admiral in the Royal Navy.

3. At Cocoa Islands, on his passage to Calcutta, aged 64, commodore sir J. Hayes.

4. At New York, aged 72, the hon. James Munroe, of Virginia, late president of the United States. He was born on Monroe's Creek in Westmoreland County, Virginia, in September, 1758; was an officer in the revolutionary war; and afterwards, in succession, member of Congress, governor of Virginia, envoy extraordinary to France and Great Britain, secretary at war, and for eight years president of the United States. After having dispensed the patronage of the government for twice the constitutional term, he retired to the ranks of private life in honourable poverty; and having been induced, by broken health and domestic afflictions, to leave Virginia for New York, died in the bosom of a daughter's family in that city. He is the third president of the United States who has died on the anniversary of their independence—the previous instances being Adams and Jefferson.

5. At Quebec, aged 29, Mr. Adam Kidd, a native of the county of Derry, author of the "Huron Chief," and several other fugitive poems.

7. In Great Surry-street, of apoplexy, aged 57, Robert William Elliston, esq. the eminent actor. Mr. Elliston was born April 7, 1774, in Orange-street, Bloomsbury. His father, a watchmaker, was the youngest son of an eminent farmer at Gidgrave, near Orford, in Suffolk, and brother to the rev. William Elliston, D.D. master of Sidney-Sussex college, Cambridge. At nine years of age young Elliston was placed at St. Paul's school, and as he was accustomed to visit his uncle Dr. Elliston at Cambridge during the vacations, he had before him good prospects in the university, and also, should he think fit to enter the clerical profession, in the church. It is said that his ambition for scenic celebrity was first excited by the applause he received at the school speeches in 1790, on delivering of an English thesis, the subject of which was, *Nemo confidat nimium secundis*. He is remembered, about the same period, to have represented Pierre, in Venice



## DEATHS.—JULY.

Preserved, at some private performances at the Lyceum, and he, shortly after abruptly quitted school, without the knowledge of his friends. He wandered to Bath, where, to procure the temporary means of subsistence, he engaged himself as clerk in a lottery office, and remained in that capacity for a few weeks, until he found an opportunity of making his theatrical essay, which was in the humble part of Tressel, in *Richard the Third*, April 21, 1791. Although this performance was very successful, the manager was not able to offer him a permanent engagement; he obtained however, from Mr. Wallis, the father of Mrs. Campbell, a letter of recommendation to Tate Wilkinson, at York, who immediately engaged him. The principal characters in Wilkinson's company being entirely pre-occupied, the truant in a short time became weary of his situation, and wrote to his uncle a letter supplicating forgiveness. He was allowed to return to his family, but could not be persuaded to relinquish his taste for the stage. In 1793 he appeared a second time at Bath in the character of Romeo; and during the season he continued to play a variety of characters in Tragedy, Comedy, Opera, and Pantomime. As his occupation in life appeared now to be decisively adopted, another uncle, the late professor Martyn, had the kindness to use his exertions to introduce him to the boards of Drury-lane; but the terms proposed not being sufficient to induce Elliston to leave Bath, he concluded an engagement there for four years. In 1796 he carried off from that city Miss Rundall, a teacher of dancing, and soon after their marriage in London made his first bow to a London audience at the Haymarket, on the 24th of June in that year, in the very opposite characters of Octavian in "*The Mountaineers*" and Vapour in "*My Grandmother*." Having performed a few nights, he returned to Bath until the latter end of the season, when he again appeared at the Haymarket as Sir Edward Mortimer in the *Iron Chest*, which only a short time before had been produced and condemned at Drury-lane, although Mr. Kemble had taken the character of Sir Edward Mortimer. From the Haymarket Mr. Elliston was engaged to perform for a limited number of nights at Covent Garden; but owing to some disagreement with Mr. Harris, he again joined the Haymarket corps;

and on Mr. Colman's new arrangement in 1803, he became not only his principal performer, but also his acting manager. In the succeeding year, when John Kemble quitted Drury-lane, Mr. Elliston was engaged to supply his place; after the theatre was burnt, when the company performed at the Lyceum, he left it in consequence of some quarrel with Thomas Sheridan. He then took the Circus, and having given it the name of the *Surry Theatre*, commenced performing some of the best plays of Shakespeare, and some Operas, having so far altered them as to bring them within the meaning of the license; a practice which he defended in a well-written pamphlet. He acted the principal parts, and was equally applauded in *Macbeth* and *Macbeth*. In 1805 he published "*The Venetian Outlaw, a Drama, in three acts*," which he had himself adapted from the French "*Abelino, le grand bandit*." On the reopening of Drury-lane Theatre, Elliston again formed part of that company: on the first night he delivered Lord Byron's opening address, and personated the character of Hamlet. When the theatre was let out on a lease in 1819, he became the lessee, at a yearly rent of 10,200*l.* and so continued until declared a bankrupt in 1826. After some speculations in the Olympic theatre, he again undertook the superintendence of the Circus, and until very lately occasionally performed upon its boards, in *Cumberland's Jew*, *Dr. Pangloss*, and some smaller parts.

9. At his house, in George-street, Hanover-square, aged 69, the hon. and right rev. William Knox, D.D. lord bishop of Derry, a trustee of the Irish Linen Manufacture, &c.; brother to lord viscount Northland. He published in 1799 "*Two Sermons preached in Trinity College Chapel*;" in 1800 "*A Thanksgiving Sermon on lord Nelson's victory*;" and in 1802, "*Revelation indispensable to Morality, a Sermon*."

— At Montagu-place, aged 66, A. E. Impey, esq.

10. Aged 65, sir George Montgomery, the second baronet of Magbie-hill, co. Peebles, (1774), knight in Parliament for that county; brother-in-law to George Byng, esq. M.P. for Middlesex, and uncle to the late earl of Blesinton. Sir George was not married; and his baronetcy is become extinct.

— Aged 86, the rev. Thomas Burrough, rector of Abbot's Anne, Hants;



## DEATHS.—JULY.

brother to sir James Burrough, late judge of the Court of Common Pleas.

11. In Lincoln's Inn, Richard Duppa, esq. LL.B. barrister-at-law, and F.S.A. He received his university education at Trinity college, Oxford, and afterwards took the degree of LL.B. at Trinity-hall, Cambridge, in the year 1814. He was the author of the following works: "A Journal of the most remarkable occurrences that took place at Rome upon the subversion of the Ecclesiastical Government in 1798," two editions in 1799. "A Selection of twelve heads from the Last Judgment of Michael Angelo, 1801," imperial folio "Heads from the fresco Pictures of Raffaele in the Vatican, 1803." folio. "The Life and Literary Works of Michael Angelo Buonarrotti, with his Poetry and Letters, 1806," 4to; second edition, 1809; third edition, 1816. "Elements of Botany, 1809." 3 vols. 8vo.—"Virgil's Bucolics, with notes, 1810." "Select Greek Sentences, 1811." 24mo. "An Edition of Martyn's Eclogues of Virgil, 1813." "On the author of Junius, 1814." "Introduction to Greek, 1815." "Observations on the price of Corn, as connected with the Commerce of the Country and the Public Revenue, 1815." "Classes and Orders of the Linnæan System of Botany, illustrated by select specimens, 1816." 3 vols. 8vo.; "Life of Raffaele, 1816." "Outlines of Michael Angelo's works, with a plan, elevation, and sections of St. Peter's, Rome, 1816." "Illustrations of the Lotus of the ancients, and the Tamara of India, 1816." (only thirty private copies). "Dr. Johnson's Diary of a Journey into North Wales in 1774, with illustrative notes, 1816." (incorporated in the late edition of Boswell's Life, by the right hon. J. W. Croker). "Miscellaneous Observations and Opinions on the Continent, 1825." "Travels in Italy, &c. 1828." "Travels on the Continent, Sicily, and the Lipari Islands, 1829." "Maxims, &c. 1830." and a pamphlet on the claims of authors to copyright.

12. At Jersey, colonel Alexander Mackenzie, formerly of 36th foot.

13. While on a visit to his son commanding the Coast Guard at Blatchington, near Seaford, aged 67, James Walker, esq. rear-admiral of the Red, C.B. and K.T.S.

14. In Montague-street, Portman-square, in his 80th year, Kenneth Fran-

cis Mackenzie, esq. formerly attorney-general for the island of Granada.

18. Aged 81, sir George Abercromby, the fourth baronet of Birkenbeg, co. Banf, (1637) and chief of the clan of Abercromby, for 48 years sheriff depute of the shires of Elgin and Nairn.

18. At Hampton, aged 73, Thomas Greatorex, esq. F.R.S. F.L.S. organist of Westminster-abbey, conductor of his majesty's concerts of ancient music, &c. Mr. Greatorex was a native of Derbyshire. He came to London in 1772, and was a pupil of Dr. Cooke, organist and master of the boys at Westminster-abbey, under whose tuition so many eminent professors have received their education. In 1774, 1775, and 1776, he attended lord Sandwich's Christmas oratorios at Hinchinbrook. At the establishment of the ancient concert, in 1776, Greatorex assisted in the choruses; and he continued a performer there, until he was advised to try a northern air for the re-establishment of his health, when he accepted the situation of organist of the cathedral of Carlisle in 1780. Here, although the emoluments were small, he has been heard to say, that he passed some of the happiest days of his life. He spent two evenings of each week in a select society, in which were included Dr. Percy, the late bishop of Dromore, then dean of Carlisle, Dr. Charles Law, the late bishop of Elphin, and archdeacon Paley. In 1784 he resigned the situation, and went to Italy, where he studied vocal music, and received instructions in singing for two years from Santarelli, the most celebrated singer of his time at Rome. He also visited all the other principal cities of Italy, and returned to England through Switzerland, Germany, the Netherlands, and Holland, at the end of 1788. He now established himself in London, and very soon had his time fully occupied as a teacher of singing. In 1793, on the resignation of Mr. Bates, he was, without solicitation, appointed conductor of the Ancient Concerts, which post he retained until his death. In 1801 he contributed to the restoration of the Vocal Concert; and in 1819 he succeeded to the situation formerly held by his master, Dr. Cook (who died in 1793), as organist and master of the boys at Westminster-abbey. His publications consisted of a compilation of Psalm Tunes, harmonised by himself, and dedicated by permission to the king; and the arrangements of



## DEATHS.—JULY.

many musical compositions for the Ancient or Vocal Concert, by adding complete orchestral, vocal, and instrumental parts. His pursuits were not altogether confined to music; he was no mean mathematician, and was much attached to astronomy, possessing several valuable telescopes. He was a Fellow of the Royal Society.

20. Aged 77, William Jemmett, esq. formerly of Little Milton, and proprietor of estates there and in other parts of the kingdom. He was high sheriff of Oxfordshire during the first illness of George III.; but was afterwards reduced to poverty by a series of misfortunes, and for some time previous to his decease was supported by charity and parochial aid.

21. In Royal-row, Westminster-road, aged 54, the eccentric Bob Bradbury, a well-known clown. He was originally a cabinet-maker at Liverpool, where he made his *debut*. He possessed prodigious strength, and some of his feats were more calculated to terrify than to amuse his auditors; he was a great favourite of the public, and one of his benefits in Dublin produced him 600*l*. He was passionately fond of dress and jewellery.

24. At Chelmsford, aged 83, John Badeley, M.D.

25. At the Cape of Good Hope, the rev. Fearon Fallows, F.R.S. Astronomer Royal at that Colony. He was formerly Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. 1813, as third Wrangler, M.A. 1816.

27. At Dublin, aged 85, the right hon. John Toler, earl of Norbury, viscount Glandine, and baron Norbury, of Ballyorenade, co. Tipperary, a Privy Councillor for Ireland, and late chief justice of the court of Common Pleas in that kingdom. He was called to the bar in Michaelmas term 1770; and in 1776 was first returned to the Irish House of Commons as one of the members for Tralee. In 1781 he was appointed a king's Counsel; and in 1784 we find him chairman of the Quarter Sessions at Kilmainham. In the latter year he was elected one of the representatives of the borough of Philipstown, in the king's County; his elder brother, Daniel Toler, esq., who died in 1796, being chosen one of the county members for Tipperary. He was at this period a very useful orator on the part of the Government; nor was his personal

prowess unacceptable. A violent speech, containing threats towards Mr. Ponsonby is recorded in the Debates of the Irish House of Commons, in Feb. 1797; and he challenged the notorious Napper Tandy, who declined the encounter. In 1789 he was appointed Solicitor-general of Ireland; and at the general election of 1790 he was chosen M. P. for Newborough, co. Wexford. On the 7th of Nov. 1797, his wife was created a peeress of Ireland. Mr. Toler was appointed Attorney-general of Ireland, July 16th, 1798, and sworn of the Privy Council on the 2nd of August. He was during that year actively engaged in the prosecution of the Irish rebels. He was advanced to be Chief Justice of the Court of Common Pleas, Dec. 20, 1800; and on the 29th of the same month was created lord Norbury. He retained the Chief Justiceship until 1827, when, on his retirement he was rewarded with a pension of 3046*l*., and advanced to the titles of viscount Glandine and earl of Norbury, with remainder to his second son.

28. At Dublin, aged 53, the right hon. Margaret Baroness Louth, sister to lord Dunsany.

29. Aged 81, the rev. Joseph Phillimore, father of Joseph Phillimore, D.C.L. judge of the Cinque Ports, &c.

30. At Ushaw-college, Durham, aged 67, Dr. Thomas Smith, Roman Catholic bishop of Bolina, and vicar apostolic in the Northern District.

31. Aged 72, William Browell, esq. lieut.-governor of Greenwich Hospital.

— At Duncaves, Perthshire, Marquess Ramsay, esq. M. A. F.L.S., Fellow and Tutor of Jesus College, Cambridge; brother to sir Alex. Ramsay, of Balmain, co. Kincardine, bart. He was the fifth son of sir Alexander the first and late baronet, by Elizabeth daughter and co-heiress of sir Alexander Bannerman, baronet and graduated B. A. as 15th Wrangler 1818, M. A. 1821.

*Lately.* At Calcutta, Dr. Turner, bishop of that see, and brother-in-law to the bishop of Chester (Dr. Sumner.)

At Paris, aged 75, lieut.-col. James O'Hara.

At Sunninghill, the right hon. Philippa baroness Sunderlin.

At Vienna, aged 43, his imperial highness the archduke Rudolph John Joseph Renier, a cardinal of the church of Rome, prince archbishop of Olmutz, youngest brother to the emperor of Austria. He was born at Florence, Jan.



## DEATHS—Aug.

8, 1788 : and created a Cardinal priest, June 4, 1819.

Sir Marcus Somerville, third baronet of Somerville, county Meath (1748), knight in Parliament for that county.

At Kentish-town, Mr. Whelan, an engraver. Reading a newspaper, he was balancing himself upon the hinder feet of the chair, when losing his equilibrium, he fell backward, and fractured his skull against a marble slab.

At Bath, the hon. Eliza, relict of colonel William Baillie, aged 70.

In Bolton-row, Piccadilly, Richard Reece, M.D. He published "The Medical and Chirurgical Pharmacopœia," 1800.—"The Domestic Medical Guide," 1803.—"Observations on the properties of the Lichen Islandicus, or Iceland Moss, in Consumption," 1804.—"A Treatise on the Radix Rhataniæ, or Rhatany root," 1808.—"Dictionary of Domestic Medicine," 1808.—"A Treatise on the Causes, Prevention, and Cure of Gout," 1810.—"A new System of Physic and Medical Surgery," 1811.—"Treatise on pulmonary Consumption, and Asthma," 1811.—"Letters on the present state of Medicine," 1811.—"Reecian Pandect of Medicine, or New Nosological arrangement of Diseases," 1812.—"Practical Treatise on the Gratiola, as a remedy for consumption, asthma, and constitutional cough," 1813.—"The Medical Guide for Tropical Climates," 1814.—&c. &c. When Joanna Southcott avowed herself to be in a state of pregnancy, the Doctor suffered himself to be deluded into an interview with the pretended prophetess, whose appearance he declared to be such as to warrant him in pronouncing her to be pregnant. At length the fallacy ended in the death of the woman, whose body was opened by the doctor, and he published the result of his observations in "A plain Narrative of the circumstances attending the last Illness and Death of Joanna Southcott," 1815.

## AUGUST.

4. At Stonehouse, near Plymouth, Alexander Robert Kerr, esq. a captain in the Royal Navy, and C.B.

5. At Worcester, aged 56, John Carden, esq. for thirty years first surgeon to the Worcester Infirmary.

6. At Gloucester-place, Portman-sq. aged 83, Wm. Rooke, esq. formerly of the Bengal Civil establishment, and brother

to the late sir Giles Rooke, Justice of the Common Pleas.

9. At Corfu, aged 25, the hon. Charles Gustavus Monckton, capt. 88th regt. second son of viscount and viscountess Galway. This young man, in the performance of his military duty was shot by a soldier who had been committing robbery, and had armed himself to destroy any individual who might recognise him.

10. At Bretton-hall, aged 68, Diana, widow of Thomas Richard Beaumont, esq. lieut. col. 21st dragoons, and M.P. for Northumberland. She was the natural daughter and heiress (by will) of sir Thos. Wentworth Blackett, of Bretton-hall, bart. and was left a widow July 31, 1829.

11. At Cove, near Cork, aged 77, Dr. William Coppinger, Roman Catholic bishop of Cloyne. He was consecrated in 1788.

12. At Cheltenham, aged 85, Mathias Hathaway, esq.

13. At Southampton, aged 52, lieut. col. John Oke, late of the 61st foot.

14. In Berkeley-square, aged 74, sir Benjamin Hobhouse, of Westbury College, co. Gloucester, and Chantry House Wilts, bart. M.A. F.R.S. and S.A., first commissioner for investigating the debts of the Carnatic, a banker at Bath, vice-president of the Literary Fund, &c. &c. He was educated at Brazenose College, Oxford, where he attained the degree of M.A. June 26, 1781; and was afterwards called to the bar. At the general election in 1796, he stood on the independent interest for Bristol; but, after polling 102 votes, declined at the close of the first day. In the following February he was returned on a vacancy for Blechingley; and on the 1st of May that year he was one of those who voted in favour of the hon. Mr. Grey's motion for a reform in Parliament. In 1802 he was returned for Grampound; in 1806 for Hindon: and he sat for that borough until compelled by ill health to retire from public life in 1818. He first came into office in 1803, as secretary to the Board of Control, during the ministry of Mr. Addington; he resigned that post in May 1804; and in 1805 was made chairman of the committees for supplies. In 1807, he was appointed first commissioner for investigating the debts of the Nabobs of the Carnatic, which office he retained until his decease. He was created a baronet by



## DEATHS.—Aug.

patent dated Dec. 22, 1812. He is succeeded by his eldest son John Cam Hobhouse.

15. Murdered by the populace at Warsaw, Frederick Fanshawe, esq. chamberlain to his late imperial highness the grand duke Constantine.

— At Mortfield, Lancashire, aged 28, James Grundy Cross, esq. M. A. of Downing-college, and of the Inner Temple, barrister-at-law.

16. At Stamford-hill, aged 79, sir Daniel Williams, knt. colonel of the Tower Hamlets' Militia, and for thirty-two years a Police Magistrate of Lambeth-street. He was knighted in June 1802.

— At Exeter, aged 72, John Macdonald, esq. Fellow of the Royal and Asiatic Societies, and formerly lieut.-col. of the Royal Clan Alpine regiment. This gentleman was the only son of the celebrated Flora Macdonald, who assisted prince Charles's escape in 1746. He published "A Treatise explanatory of the principles constituting the practice and theory of the violoncello." "A Treatise on Telegraphic communication;" several articles in the Philosophical Transactions, and one or two works relative to military discipline and tactics, besides various communications in the Gentleman's Magazine, both on political and miscellaneous topics.

17. At his lodgings in South Lambeth, aged 45, Mr. Peter Nasmyth, a distinguished painter. He was the eldest son of Alexander Nasmyth of Edinburgh, the landscape painter. At the age of twenty he came to London, where his talents were soon appreciated, and he got the name of the English Hobbima. Hobbima and Ruysdael were his favourite masters. In a late thunder-storm, when too weak to support himself upright, he wished the curtains to be drawn aside, and begged his sisters to lift him up, that he might register in his memory the splendour of the passing effects.

18. At Deal, Richard Budd Vincent, esq. a captain in the Royal Navy, and C. B.

— At Redesdale-house, near Stillorgan, aged 66, the most rev. William Magee, D.D. archbishop of Dublin, bishop of Glandelagh, and primate of Ireland; chancellor of the illustrious Order of St. Patrick, Visitor of Trinity College, Dublin, and M.R.I.A. Dr. Magee was the son of parents very humble in life, and was a servitor in

Trinity College, Dublin, of which he was afterwards the distinguished ornament. He was for some time assistant professor of Oriental Tongues; about 1806 he became a Senior Fellow, and professor of Mathematics. His celebrated "Discourses on the Scriptural Doctrines of the Atonement and Sacrifice," were published in 1801, in two volumes 8vo. and were dedicated to the present lord chancellor of Ireland. In consequence of the great and merited reputation which followed the publication of this book, Dr. Magee was advanced, in 1813, to the deanery of Cork. In 1819 he was consecrated bishop of Raphoe, and in 1822 was translated to the See of Dublin, by the late lord Liverpool. Dr. Magee's other publications consisted of, "A Thanksgiving Sermon on the Delivery of this kingdom from Invasion, 1797," "A Sermon occasioned by the death of the earl of Clare, 1802;" and "A Memoir of Thomas Percival, M.D. F.R.S. and S.A. printed in the Gentleman's Magazine, vol. lxxiv. pp. 1067, 1162.

20. At his seat, Lydney-park, Gloucestershire, the rt. hon. Charles Bragge Bathurst, D.C.L. a privy councillor, a bencher of Lincoln's Inn, and formerly chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster. He was the eldest son of Charles Bragge, of Cleve-hall, in Gloucestershire, esq. by Anne, daughter of Benjamin Bathurst, of Lydney, esq. F.R.S. and successively M.P. for Cirencester, Gloucester, and Monmouth; nephew to Allen, first earl Bathurst. Mr. Bragge was educated at Winchester, under Dr. Warton, and then elected to a fellowship at New College, Oxford, as of founder's kin. He took the degree of B.C.L. Dec. 17, 1785; and was created D.C.L. June 16, 1814. Having been called to the bar, he was for many years a leading counsel at the quarter-sessions at Gloucester. His cousin earl Bathurst, whilst lord chancellor, presented him with the office of clerk of the Presentations. At the general election of 1796 he was elected M.P. for Bristol; and on the 14th of December that year, when Mr. Fox moved a vote of censure on the ministry, Mr. Bragge moved the amendment, which was carried on division by a majority of 104. He was one of the secret committee of fifteen, nominated Nov. 15, 1797, to examine into the situation of the Bank of England, and afterwards brought up the report as



## DEATHS.—Aug.

chairman. In 1799 he was chairman of the committee of Supply. In 1801, on the formation of the ministry of lord Sidmouth, whose sister Mr. Bragge had married in 1788, he was appointed treasurer of the navy, in the room of the hon. Dudley Ryder (now earl of Harrowby), and was sworn a privy councillor. He was re-chosen for Bristol at the general election of 1802. In June 1803, he resigned his office in favour of Mr. Tierney. On the 12th of August following a new writ was ordered for Bristol, Mr. Bragge having accepted the stewardship of the Chiltern Hundreds; he was re-elected, after having, during the vacancy, received the appointment of secretary at War, the business of which department he executed until Mr. Pitt's return to power in May 1804. On the death of Anne, widow of his brother-in-law Pool Bathurst, esq. May 5, 1804, Mr. Bragge succeeded to Lydney, and the other estates of that branch of the family of Bathurst, and on the 24th of October following, received the royal license to assume the name. After the dissolution of Parliament in 1806, Mr. Bathurst was appointed master of the Mint; which office he retained until 1810, when he was succeeded by his cousin, the present earl Bathurst. On the 22nd of June 1812, he was appointed chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster, in which office he continued to Jan. 1823. He was re-elected for Bristol in 1806 and 1807: he was in 1812 for Bodmin, and in 1818 for Harwich. He had a pension of 350*l.* charged on the civil list, granted him in 1826; and his widow enjoys 1,000*l.* per annum, granted her at three several times, 600*l.* in 1823, 300*l.* in 1825, and 100*l.* in 1829.

23. At upper Halling, Kent, William Golding, who in June last completed his 100th year. Up to that time he was in the habit of spending his evenings in a public-house in the village, where he occasionally favoured the company with a song, which he sung with all the spirit and vivacity of youth. He had followed the occupation of a woodreeve.

24. At the house of Wm. Phipson, esq. Edgbaston, Warwickshire, aged 48, Gabriel J. M. de Lys, M.D. one of the physicians to the General Hospital at Birmingham. He was the representative of a noble family in Brittany; was brought to this country when a child, on his father's flying from the horrors of the revolution, and was educated at the school

for the sons of the French emigrant nobility at Pen, in Bucks. He settled at Birmingham in 1808. He was an able lecturer at the Philosophical Institution of that town.

24. At Leeds, aged 52, John White, esq. the celebrated violinist, and for many years organist of the churches of Harewood and Wakefield.

25. At Bristol, after a very long illness, the rev. Samuel Seyer, M.A. Rector of Felton, Gloucestershire, vice-president of the Bristol Library Society. &c. In 1812, he published in a quarto volume, "The Charters and Letters Patent granted by the Kings and Queens of England to the town and city of Bristol, newly translated and accompanied by the original Latin," in the preface to which he first announced an "Intended History of Bristol;" the publication of the latter he commenced in the year 1821, when appeared the first part of volume I. of what he entitled, "Memoirs Historical and Topographical of Bristol and its Neighbourhood, from the earliest period down to the present time." This was afterwards extended to two quarto volumes. He was also author of a popular Latin Grammar, which has gone through several editions. He translated likewise into English verse the Latin Poem of Vida on Chess; and in 1808 he published "Latinum Redivivum: or a treatise on the modern use of the Latin language, and the prevalence of the French; to which is added a specimen of the Latin language, accommodated to modern use."

28. In his 83rd year, Andrew Strachan, esq. printer to the king.

29. In Downing-street, Alexander Dawson, esq. M.P. for Louth.

*Lately.* In Bath, aged 86, lady Charlotte, widow of Stephen Ram, esq. of Burnsfoot, county Wexford, and Portswood, Hants, aunt to the earl of Courtown.

In Perthshire, Clerk Rattray, esq. one of the barons of the Exchequer, in Scotland.

At Vienna, in his 92nd year, baron O'Connell, colonel in the Austrian army, and chamberlain to the emperor. In 1762 the baron, with his cousin, now general count O'Connell, uncle to the member for Kerry, left Ireland, and sought promotion in foreign states; one chose the service of Austria, the other that of France. The count attained high rank in the French army previously to



## DEATHS.—SEPT.

the revolution; the empress Maria Theresa detached baron O'Connell from his military career early in life, and appointed him her chamberlain, which honourable office he held for fifty-nine years, under the emperors Joseph, Leopold, and Francis. The baron bequeathed his property to his nephew, Geoffrey O'Connell, esq. of Cork.

*Lately.* Mrs. Elizabeth Atherton, of Prescott. By her will, she gave to the vicar and steward of Prescott (for the time being) 500*l.* in trust, for "old men and widows, being decayed housekeepers of Prescott." To the grammar school in that town 500*l.*; to the Public Infirmary at Liverpool 1,000*l.*; to the Asylum for the Blind, Liverpool, 500*l.*; to the Blue Coat Hospital, Liverpool, 500*l.*; to the Warrington Meeting, or the Society for the Relief of Clergymen's Widows and Orphans, 500*l.*; to the Society for the Promoting Christian Knowledge, 500*l.*; to the Dispensary at Ormskirk, 100*l.*; and to the poor of the respective parishes of Ormskirk, Scarisbrick, Skelmersdale, and Bickerstaff, 10*l.* each.

At Cheltenham, aged 81, sir Charles Green, knight and baronet, of Milnrow in Yorkshire, a general in the army, and colonel of the 37th regiment, a member of the Consolidated Board of General Officers, and a Commissioner of the Royal Military College.

In Regent-street, aged 67, sir Hugh Innes, of Lochalsh, county of Ross, M.P. for the county of Sutherland.

At Worcester, aged 57, sir Edward Denny, the third baronet of Tralee castle, county Kerry.

Drowned in Loughcorrib (with two other persons) the hon. M. Browne, high sheriff of the county, and a captain in the army, brother to lord Kilmaine.

The right hon. lady Augusta, wife of colonel Henry M. Clavering, elder sister to the duke of Argyll.

At Killarney, lieutenant-colonel William M'Carthy, late of the 96th regiment.

At Machany, aged 76, the hon. Elizabeth Drummond, cousin to viscount Strathallan.

James Drummond, esq. of Drummowhance, a general in the army.

## SEPTEMBER.

3. At Jamaica, an old creole negro woman, named Catherine Hiatt, formerly belonging to the late hon. John Hiatt, but free for many years past, whose computed age was upwards of 150 years!

as she frequently said she was a good-sized girl at the insurrection of the Coromantee negroes, which happened in Carpenter's Mountains, Clarendon, in the year 1690! She retained all her faculties to the last moment, and did coarse needle-work until a very short time previous to her death.

4. At Southampton, Oswald Werge, esq. formerly lieutenant-col. 17th Light Dragoons.

— At Stanwick, the seat of lord Prudhoe, aged 47, Mary, wife of the hon. and right rev. Hugh Percy, D.D. lord bishop of Carlisle.

5. In his palace, at Worcester, aged 77, the right rev. Folliott Herbert Walker Cornwall, D.D. lord bishop of Worcester.

— At Belgaum, Bombay, aged 63, Brigadier general Michael Kennedy. His military career in India, which was long and active, commenced in 1781, when he went out as a volunteer, having been invited thither by a relative who commanded the Madras artillery, but whose death, while Mr. Kennedy was on his passage, deprived him of the advantages that had been held out to him. He was actively employed during the first Seringapatam campaign and was wounded before that place in Feb. 1792. In 1802 he joined the army under sir W. Clark, and was shortly after appointed to the command of Fort Vittoria; and subsequently town major of Bombay. In 1818 he captured Munden-ghur, one of the strongest and most commanding hill forts, and afterwards those of Paulghur and Ranghur; and following up these successes, he reduced the whole country between the 17th and 18th degrees from the sea to the Ghauts, closing the campaign by the capture of Rutna Gurry. His son Dr. R. H. Kennedy is the author of a late work on Cholera, and another son James Kennedy, esq. has employed his pen in general literature.

8. In Jamaica, Frances Johnson, a sambo woman slave, aged 107 years. She retained all her faculties to her decease.

— At Bristol, aged 97, Matthew Bridale, esq. formerly representative in Parliament for that city.

8. At his house in Bury St. Edmund's, in his 90th year, sir Thomas Gery Cul-lum, the seventh baronet of Hawsted and Hardwick house, in Suffolk, a deputy lieutenant and magistrate for that county, a capital Burgess for Bury, F.R. A. and L.SS.

10. At Exeter, aged 77, the rev.



## DEATHS.—SEPT.

James Manning, for fifty three years minister of the Independent congregation at George's meeting-house, where he succeeded the celebrated Micaiah Towgood. Mr. Manning was a native of Exeter, and published "The Life and Writings of the rev, Micaiah Towgood," 1792, 8vo.; "A Sermon on the death of the rev. Rice Harris, D.D. 1795, 8vo.; "Exercises of Piety, by Zollikofer, translated from the French," 1796, 8vo.

11. In Whitehall-place, aged 65, the right hon. John Calcraft, knight in Parliament for the county of Dorset. He was the son and heir of John Calcraft, esq. an eminent army agent, who accumulated a great fortune, and became proprietor of large estates in Dorsetshire. He died in 1772, being then M.P. for Rochester. The late Mr. Calcraft was first returned to Parliament in 1796 for the borough of Wareham, in which he possessed considerable property; and was re-chosen in 1802. He generally voted with the opposition; but for a time attached himself more particularly to the interests of the prince of Wales. On the formation of the Grenville Administration, Mr. Calcraft was appointed clerk of the Ordnance, Feb. 15, 1806. In the same year he was returned to Parliament for Rochester, where he was re-elected in 1807 and 1812. In 1818 Mr. Calcraft lost his election for Rochester; and from that time until the present year he sat for the borough of Wareham. In June 1828 he accepted the office of paymaster of the Forces, and was sworn of the Privy Council. He retired from office with the other members of the Wellington administration, with whose views he appeared to coincide until the debate on the Reform bill on the 22nd of last March, when, to the astonishment of all his acquaintance, he voted with the 301, which formed the majority of one by which that measure first passed a second reading. On the credit of this vote, Mr. Calcraft became the Reform candidate for Dorsetshire, in opposition to Mr. Bankes; and, after a severe contest, he was successful. For the last three or four months of his life, he was remarkably low and dejected, and on the afternoon of the 11th of September, whilst his youngest daughter (the only member of his family in town,) was absent at church, he terminated his existence by cutting his throat. See *Chronicle* p. 155.

13. At Elwick-hall, aged 65, the wife

of the hon. sir James Allan Park, justice of the Common Pleas.

14. The day after he had completed his 51st year, at Somer's-town, Mr. William Bonneau Noble, formerly an artist of some promise. Nephew to Mr. William Noble, a well-known drawing-master, who died in 1805, and who succeeded to the connexion of his father-in-law, Mr. Jacob Bonneau, tutor in drawing to some of the royal family, and to many of the nobility of the time, he commenced his professional career in the same line, and pursued it, for some years, in a prosperous manner. In two successive summers he walked through Wales, and made many beautiful sketches of its scenery. Several water-colour paintings from these, produced at a great expense of time and labour, he sent for exhibition to the Royal Academy, about the year 1810. In previous years his drawings had always been accepted; when, therefore, on visiting Somerset-house, he found that not one of his pictures was now "hung up," the disappointment sunk deep into his soul. He regarded it as a sentence of death passed upon him as an artist: and practically, he acquiesced in the unjust doom. Another disappointment, which he suffered about the same time, touched him more closely still. He had become deeply attached to a young lady, and sought to obtain the consent of her father. But the only result of his application was the immediate extinction of his hopes. Nothing now appeared, in his eyes, of sufficient importance to stimulate exertion, and habits of irregularity were formed. These led to new troubles and anxieties, of which a temporary oblivion was too often sought in dissipation, and he soon found himself almost without employment. In Nov. 1825, he was suddenly seized with a delirium, in which he made a desperate attempt upon his own life. The wound he inflicted, though serious, did not prove mortal; and the effusion of blood carried away with it the delusion under which he had shed it. Though so reduced in his circumstances as to be in part dependant on his relatives for support, he bore his depressed condition with every appearance of equanimity. He left behind him a poem of considerable length entitled "The Artist."

16. At Chelvey, Somerset, aged 83, the rev. William Shaw, D.D. for thirty-six years rector of that parish, and F.S.A. He was one of the last surviving



## DEATHS.—Oct.

intimate friends of Dr. Johnson, and one of the literary coterie which met constantly at Bolt-court and Streatham-park. He published "Suggestions on a plan of National Education," 1801, 8vo.

Accidentally shot by his own gun, whilst crossing a hedge, the rev. William Wilson, rector of Harrington, Northamptonshire, to which he was presented in 1801 by the earl of Dysart.

16. At Blaneme, near Dunse, Berwickshire, aged 112, Mr. William Carlyle. He was born at Dundee, about the middle of 1719. During the rebellion in 1745 he served in the army of sir John Cope, against the Pretender, and was present at the battle of Preston. At this time he was a private in Lee's regiment, in the troop of capt. Braimer.

19. Of apoplexy, while on a visit to his son-in-law gen. sir John Buchan, K.C.B., colonel Mark Wilks, of the Madras army; of Portland-place, and Kirby in the Isle of Man.

20. At Burfield Lodge, Berks, in his 70th year, the hon. Frederick Lumley, brother to the earl of Scarborough.

24. At Brighton, in his 14th year, the hon. Charles Wm. Lambton, eldest son of lord Durham, and grandson of earl Grey.

26. At Dumbarton, the day following the decease of his eldest son, Jacob Dixon, esq. Provost of Dumbarton.

28. In Upper Wimpole-street, aged 69, lieut.-general Malcolm Grant, of the East India Company's service.

— At Bury St. Edmund's, aged 68, Charles Bloomfield, esq. a member of the Corporation of that town, father of the lord bishop of London.

29. At the house of his wife's sister the countess de Salis, in Carlton-gardens, after a very few days' illness, aged 42, John Henry North, esq. judge of the court of Admiralty in Ireland, and M.P. for Drogheda. Mr. North was a member of Trinity College, Dublin, and was called to the bar in 1810. He was brought into Parliament in 1825 (as a member for Milbourne Port), under the auspices of Mr. Canning, of whose policy he was an ardent supporter. He was first elected for Drogheda in 1830; and was appointed judge of the Irish admiralty court by the duke of Wellington, on the removal of sir Jonah Barrington.

*Lately.* At Northampton, John Hoyal, esq. formerly of York: author of "An Historical Survey of the Gypsies," and other works.

VOL. LXXIII.

Dr. Lyall, late British resident at Madagascar, and author of "Travels in Russia."

In Jamaica, aged 146, Joseph Ram, a black, belonging to Morice Hall's estate.

Near St. Leonard's-hill, aged 63, by being thrown from his horse, the marquis d'Harcourt, a principal legatee of the late earl Harcourt.

At Gran, in Hungary, aged 71, Cardinal Alexander Von Rudnay, archbishop of Gran and primate of Hungary.

In Portman-square, aged 68, the right hon. Matthew Montague, fourth lord Rokeby, of Armagh; and the sixth baronet of Rokeby in Yorkshire. He was born Nov. 23, 1762, and was the second son of Morris Robinson, esq. of the Six Clerks' Office, Chancery-lane. He took the name and arms of Montague by royal sign manual in 1776, pursuant to a petition of his aunt, the celebrated literary character, who was the widow of Edward Montagu, of Allarthorpe, esq. a grandson of the first earl of Sandwich. He was elected to Parliament for Bossiney on a vacancy in 1786; and in the next Parliament, from 1790 to 1796, sat for Tregony. In 1800, on the death of his aunt, at the age of eighty, he inherited the large landed property which had been settled upon her by her husband, and he subsequently gave the world four volumes of her Letters. He succeeded to the family titles on the death of his brother Morris, the third lord Rokeby, May 21, 1829.

## OCTOBER.

1. In London, aged 64, the right hon. Thomas Stapleton, lord le Despencer.

2. At Wheatfield, Oxon, aged 35, the rev. Frederick Charles Spencer, rector of that parish, nephew and cousin to the duke of Marlborough.

8. At Jamaica, sir William Anglin Scarlett, chief justice of that Island, and younger brother of sir James Scarlett, the late attorney-general.

12. In Beaumont-street aged 83, Nathaniel Coffin, esq. elder brother of adm. sir Isaac Coffin, bart., 34 years collector of his majesty's Customs at Basseterre, St. Kitt's.

14. At Florence, the celebrated astronomer Louis Pons, keeper of the cabinet of Natural History belonging to the grand duke of Tuscany.

15. The rev. Richard Janson, minis-

S



## DEATHS.—Nov.

ter of the new church at Stretton, Cheshire. He was killed by the fall of a tree, during a gale of wind, at Wilderspool causeway, near Warrington.

18. John Tempest, esq. of Lincoln's-inn, barrister-at-law.

— In Harley-street, in his 70th year, the hon. Charles Fitzroy, a general in the army, colonel of the 25th foot; uncle to lord Southampton.

20. Aged 58, George Roots, esq., recorder of Kingston-on-Thames, and for more than thirty years a commissioner of bankrupts.

28. At Kenward-park, Kent, aged 75, sir John Gregory Shaw, the fifth baronet of his family.

— In Hanover-square, aged 66, sir George Nayler, knight, K.H., C.T.S., and Chas. III., garter principal king at arms, and F.S.A.

31. Accidentally shot by a play-fellow near Eton-college, aged 13, sir John Carmichael Anstruther, of Elie-house, co. Fife. He was the only and posthumous child of sir John Anstruther, (who assumed the name of Carmichael in 1817 on being served heir to the last earl of Hyndford, and died in Feb. 1818) by Jesse, 3rd daughter of major-general Dewar, who married, 2ndly, Robert Marsham, D.C.L. the warden of Merton-college, where the young baronet's remains were interred on the 8th Nov.

*Lately.* Arthur Clegg, esq. leaving behind him property to the value of upwards of half a million, which he acquired chiefly in the town of Manchester.

At Edinburgh, aged 68, Andrew Smith, esq. senior rear-admiral of the Red.

Josias Walker, M.A. professor of Humanity at the University of Glasgow.

At Glasgow, David Walker, esq. the American consul-gen. in Scotland.

At Calais, aged 72, Richard Bentley, esq. grandson of Richard Bentley, D.D. of Trinity-college Cambridge.

In France, aged 39, Theobald lord Walsh.

At Passy, M. Sebastian Erard, well known in Europe for his improvement in harps and pianos.

At Cheltenham, aged 87, the hon. Robt. Moore, half uncle to the marquis of Drogheda.

## NOVEMBER.

1. At Wapaghkonnett, Blackhoof, aged 114, one of the chiefs of the Shawnessee tribe of Indians.

2. Aged 60, at Barnes, Patrick Bernard Foley, esq. major of the 7th Royal Fusileers.

At Abingdon-hall, lieut.-col. George Edward Graham Foster Pigott, M.P. for Kinrosshire from 1826 to 1830.

6. At Dundee, Dr. Patterson, a bishop of the church of Rome. He died suddenly of apoplexy, having performed the services of the afternoon in the chapel.

7. In Clifford-st. lieut.-col. Richard Rochfort, of Brettwell-house, Oxon. late consul-general of East Friesland.

— At Dover, on his way to Naples, aged 80, sir Nathaniel William Wraxall, bart. He was only son of William Wraxall, esq. merchant of Bristol, by Anne, great niece to sir James Thornhill, the historical painter. Sir William had acquired a certain degree of literary celebrity by his productions, among which the one that obtained the most distinction, both by its popularity and the numerous attacks directed against it, was the latest of them all, namely "Historical Memoirs of my own Time," 3 vols. 8vo, 1815. His preceding publications were a "Tour through some of the Northern parts of Europe," 1775, which passed through four editions; "Memoirs of the Kings of France of the Race of Valois," 2 vols. 8vo. 1784; "The History of France from the accession of Henry III to the death of Louis XIV.," 3 vols. 4to., 1795, and 6 vols. 8vo., 1814, and "Memoirs of the Courts of Berlin, Dresden, &c." 2 vols 8vo. 1799, and 1800.

14. At Turnham-green, in his 80th year, sir John Pinhorn, knt., of Ringwood house, in the Isle of Wight.

15. At Coburg, aged 73, her serene highness Augusta Caroline, Duchess dowager of Saxe Coburg Saalfeld, mother of Ernest, the reigning duke; of prince Leopold, the king of the Belgians; and of her Royal highness the duchess of Kent. Besides the above, her highness had also three other children, namely, a son, who is a lieutenant field-marshal in the Austrian service; and two daughters (both older than the duchess of Kent) one married to count de Mensdorff, governor of Mayencé, the other to the late grand duke Constantine of Russia, but separated from him in 1820.

19. At Craster hall, near Alnwick, aged 72, Isabella, wife of Shafto Craster, esq.

— At Oxton, Notts, W.C. Sherbrooke,



## DEATHS.—DEC.

esq. for many years chairman of the county quarter sessions.

19. The fire king, M. Chabert; the cause of his death was internal inflammation produced by taking phosphorus.

— In Abingdon-street, Joseph Terry Hone, esq. barrister-at-law and a police magistrate at Union-hall.

20. At Chellowes-park, Surrey, aged 84, James Donovan, esq.

— At Airy hill, near Whitby, in his 73rd year, Richard Moorsom, esq. a justice of the peace, and deputy-lieut. of the North Riding of the county of York.

21. At Hare-hatch, Berks, aged 74, sir George Sowley Holroyd, knight, late a justice of the Court of King's Bench. He formerly went the Northern Circuit, where he was distinguished by his knowledge of special pleading. He was appointed to his seat on the bench in 1816, and resigned his judicial functions in 1829.

22. At his seat, Lullingstone Castle, Kent aged 67, sir Thomas Dyke, bart.

23. At Hargham-hall, aged 29, Elizabeth Bridget, lady of sir T. Beevor, bart.

24. At his seat, Tali Arias, county Carmarthen, aged nearly 83, the right hon. lord Robert Seymour, joint clerk of the crown in the King's Bench of Ireland; grandfather of lord Southampton, and uncle to the marquis of Hertford, K.G., the late marquis of Londonderry, K.G., the marquis of Drogheda, &c.

— At his prebendal-house, Winchester, the rev. Richard Cockburn, B.D. rector of Barming, and vicar of Boxley, Kent, and a prebendary of Winchester. He obtained, in 1802 and 1803, the prize for the Seatonian poem; the subjects were St. Peter's Denial of Christ, and Christ raising the daughters of Jairus, both published in 4to. In 1803 he was chosen to be the first to fill the post of Christian Advocate, founded pursuant to the will of Mr. Hulse. He retained it for the period of six years; and published several treatises calculated to fulfil the intentions of the pious founder; the first of which was "Remarks on Volney's Ruins of Empires." In 1804, he published "An authentic account of the late unfortunate death of lord Camelford, with an extract from his lordship's will, and some remarks upon his character."

25. At Brighton, in his 32nd year, captain Henry Murray, formerly of the Coldstream Guards; brother to the bishop of Rochester.

28. Aged 77, sir Charles Henry Knowles, bart. admiral of the Red, and G.C.B.

29. At St. Petersburg, Jane, princess of Lowicz, widow of the grand duke Constantine; she was by birth countess of Grudzinska, and was married by the late grand duke, May 20, 1820.

30. At Clovelly rectory, Devonshire, of epilepsy, aged 30, the rev. Orlando Hamlyn Williams, rector of that parish, brother to sir James Hamlyn Williams, bart. M.P. for Carmarthenshire.

*Lately.* In Ulster-place, aged 78, Julia Elizabeth, widow of sir William Congreve, the first baronet.

At Bombay, F. W. Jones, esq. of the Civil Service, second son of lieut.-general sir Richard Jones, K.C.B.

On his passage from India, aged 46, lieut.-colonel William Wilson, 31, Bengal N. I.

At Bath, aged 81, Dorothea, widow of sir John Lethbridge, of Sandhill-park, bart.

At Paris, Pamela, widow of the unfortunate lord Edward Fitzgerald. She was the daughter of Madame de Genlis by the duke of Orleans, and after the death of lord Edward, married M. Pitcairn, who survives her. She left by lord Edward a son, Edward Fox Fitzgerald, esq. who married in 1827 Jane, youngest daughter of sir John Dean Paul, bart.; and two daughters, Pamela, married in 1820 to lieut.-colonel sir Guy Campbell, bart., and Lucy Louisa, in 1825, to captain George Francis Lyon, R. N.

At Edinburgh, the wife of the right hon. John Learmouth, lord Provost.

At Keith-house, near Edinburgh, lady Margaret, wife of Alexander Maclean, esq. aunt to the earl of Hopetoun.

Aged 84, Alexander Stewart, esq. uncle to the marquess of Londonderry.

At the Grange, near Ellesmere, the right hon. Harriet lady Tara.

## DECEMBER.

3. At Haggerston Castle, Northumberland, aged 75, sir Carraby Haggerston, fifth bart. of that place.

6. In Cumberland-street, Portman-square, the right hon. sir A. Hart, knt. late Lord Chancellor of Ireland, in the 72nd year of his age. He was born in the year 1759, in the Island of St. Christopher. At an early age he was sent to England for education, and



## DEATHS.—DEC.

placed at Tonbridge school; in the year 1776 he was admitted a student of the Middle Temple, and called to the bar in 1781. He practised first in the West Indies, and afterwards at the Chancery bar here. In 1807 he was made king's counsel, and in the same year elected a bencher in the Middle Temple. In 1813 he was selected to fill the office of solicitor-general to her majesty queen Charlotte. In 1827 Mr. Hart was appointed Vice-chancellor, received the honour of knighthood, and was sworn in as one of his majesty's most honourable Privy Council, and in the autumn of the same year on the retirement of lord Manners he was raised to the Chancellorship of Ireland, which office he filled until the resignation of the duke of Wellington in 1830, when he was recalled. The great patience, unwearied attention, and masterly knowledge of the principles and practice of a Court of Equity gained for sir A. Hart, during his continuation in office in Ireland, the respect and regard of those who practised at and who were suitors in the Court of Chancery there, while the upright and impartial manner in which he discharged the other duties of his high office called forth general esteem.

8. At Plasnewedd, Llangollen, aged 76, Miss Sarah Ponsonby, the friend of the late lady Eleanor Butler, with whom she resided in that romantic retreat more than fifty years. She was the daughter of Chambre Brabazon Ponsonby, esq., son of major-general the hon. Henry Ponsonby, who was killed at the battle of Fontenoy in 1745.

9. At Ashford Staines, aged 55, lieutenant-colonel George Russell Deare, late of the 8th light dragoons.

10. Executed at Malaga, with fifty-two companions with whom he had landed there, hoping, from the treacherous promises of the governor (Moreno) to effect a successful insurrection against Ferdinand, general Torrijos, the Spanish constitutional leader. He entered the military service at a very early age, and was soon noticed by the Irish general Doyle, by whom he was selected to lead a sortie from Tortosa, in 1810. At the battle of Vittoria he commanded the second brigade of infantry; from which he was promoted to the rank of Brigadier general, and distinguished himself in the battle of the Pyrenees and throughout the French campaign. His services in the cause of freedom, and his liberal opinions caused him to

be imprisoned in the Inquisition, in 1817, where he continued three years. In 1820 he shared the triumph of the patriots, and held a variety of important commands, till he was called from the command of the Constitutional army in Biscay and Navarre, to fill the situation of minister of war in 1823. After the constitutional government ceased to exist, he emigrated and passed some time in England, and was active in endeavouring to overthrow the arbitrary rule of Ferdinand; it was to his zeal in the pursuit of this purpose that he owed his premature death, at about the age of 43. Among those who suffered with him, was Mr. Robt. Boyd, brother to Mr. W. Boyd, of the Irish bar.

15. In the Regent's-park, in his 11th year, John Hugh, eldest son of J. G. Lockhart, esq. and grandson to sir Walter Scott, bart.

16. In Harley-street, aged 42, the hon. James Berkeley Rodney, late lieutenant-colonel 3rd Guards, brother to lord Rodney.

— At Plymouth, aged 78, Robert Barton, esq. vice-admiral of the Red.

17. At Breda, aged nearly 64, John Spencer, esq. D.C.L. of Wheatfield, Oxfordshire; first cousin and brother-in-law to the duke of Marlborough. He was eldest son of lord Charles Spencer, second son of the second duke.

19. In Bridge-street, Blackfriars, Mr. W. Waithman, third son of Mr. Alderman Waithman, M.P.

20. In Cirencester-place, aged 81, Sam. Middiman, esq. the engraver of "Picturesque Views and Antiquities of Great Britain," complete in 2 vols. 4vo. 1811.

22. At Leamington, Warwick, the right hon. Elizabeth countess dowager of Darnley.

27. At Chippen Warden, Northamptonshire, aged 73, the rev. John Lamb, D.D. rector of that parish, who shot himself through the breast, having been for some time previously in a desponding state of mind.

— In Bryanstone-st., aged 53, Eliza, wife of lieutenant-gen. C. Callender.

31. In London, aged about 70, Mrs. Renaud, the actress, formerly known as the beautiful Mrs. Powell.

*Lately.* At Dover, sir Thomas Mantell, F.A.L. and H.SS., author of a small quarto tract on "Coronation Ceremonies and Customs, relative to the Barons of the Cinque Ports," 1820, and one or two other pieces.



## DEATHS.—DEC.

At Chislehurst, Kent, John Martin, esq. banker of Lombard-st, and for many years M.P. for 'Tewkesbury.

Robert Alexander Crickett, esq. of Smyth's Hall, Essex, M.P. for Ipswich, from 1807 to 1820.

At Liverpool, N. G. Philips, esq. an amateur artist of great taste and skill, and author of "Views in Lancashire."

At Edinburgh, Alicia, widow of sir John Wedderburn (the sixth bart. of Nova Scotia, but for the attainder of 1746,) and step-mother to sir David Wedderburn, the present bart. so created in 1803.

At Roehampton, aged 31, lord Arthur Augustus Edwin Hill, brother to the marquess of Downshire.

At Banff Castle, sir Robert Turing, of Foveran, co. Aberdeen, bart.

Horatio Cock, esq. of Colchester. He bequeathed nearly 35,000*l.* to charitable institutions, including 9000*l.* to the British and Foreign Bible Society, and 9000*l.* to the Society for promoting Christianity amongst the Jews.

In St. Giles's workhouse, Jack Mitford an author and very eccentric character. He was originally in the navy, and fought under Hood and Nelson. His name will be remembered in connection with lady Percival, in the Blackheath affair. For many years before his death, Mitford lived by chance, and slept three nights in the week in the open air, when his finances did not admit of his paying threepence for a den in St. Giles's. Though formerly a nautical fop, for the last fourteen years of his life, he was ragged and loathsome: he never thought but of the necessities of the moment. He had some classical knowledge, and maintained his miserable existence by literary efforts, the memory of which is not worth preserving. Among them was a libellous life of the late Recorder sir John Sylvester. His largest work was the history of "Johnny Newcome in the Navy," the publisher of which gave him a shilling a day until he finished it. He lived the

whole of this time in Bayswater fields, making a bed at night of grass and nettles; two pennyworth of bread and cheese, and an onion were his daily food; the rest of the shilling he expended in gin. He thus passed forty-three days, washing his shirt and stockings in a pond, when he required clean linen. He edited "The Scourge" and "Bon Ton Magazine." At the time of his death he was editing a penny production, called the "Quizzical Gazette."

William Bilderdijk, the most celebrated and talented writer of Holland, among his contemporaries, and the patriarch of its present literary generation. He was well versed in the chief European languages, and acquainted with various branches of belles lettres and science. As a poet, he produced several works distinguished as well by the originality of thought they display, as by the elegance of their diction, and the captivating graces of style. His "Diseases of studious men" in six cantos, 1807, is the finest descriptive poem in the Dutch language, and treated with such masterly skill as to be highly attractive, notwithstanding the somewhat repulsive, and apparently anti-poetical nature of the subject itself. Next in degree of merit, less original in its materials, but marked by equal beauty and richness of style, is his "Rural Life", a free and spirited imitation of Delisle's *L'Homme des Champs*. Numerous lyrical pieces scattered through his works attest his ability in that species of composition, nor was he less successful in the ballad, and in serious or playful narrative. In addition to these and various other poetical works, he produced several tragedies,—*"Willem van Holland;" "Cormac,"* &c. with a critical dissertation on that branch of the drama; also an Essay on Ossian, serving as an appendix to his metrical translation of the ancient bard. Bilderdijk was born at Amsterdam in 1756, and was buried at Haarlem on the 23rd of December.



FINANCE ACCOUNTS

- CLASS I. PUBLIC INCOME.
- II. PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.
- III. DISPOSITION OF GRANTS.

PUBLIC INCOME OF THE UNITED KINGDOM,

HEADS OF REVENUE.	GROSS RECEIPT.			Repayments, Allowances, Discounts, Drawbacks, and Bounties in the Nature of Drawbacks, &c.		
ORDINARY REVENUES.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Customs .....	21,084,524	19	8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	1,557,424	5	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>
Excise .....	22,354,887	16	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	2,537,505	18	3 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>
Stamps .....	7,555,065	7	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	306,981	12	7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>
Taxes, under the Management of the Commissioners of Taxes ....	5,301,279	7	0 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	6,409	0	2
Post Office .....	2,301,432	11	0 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	89,226	5	6
One Shilling in the Pound, and Sixpence in the Pound on Pensions and Salaries, and Four Shillings in the Pound on Pensions .....	52,351	16	10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	..	..	
Hackney Coaches, and Hawkers and Pedlars .....	67,925	19	9	..	..	
Crown Lands .....	363,742	0	4	..	..	
Small Branches of the King's Hereditary Revenue .....	7,260	2	7	..	..	
Surplus Fees of Regulated Public Offices.....	44,684	3	9	..	..	
Poundage Fees, Pells' Fees, Casualties, Treasury Fees, and Hospital Fees .....	9,096	9	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	..	..	
TOTALS of Ordinary Revenues.....	59,142,250	14	1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	4,497,547	2	2
OTHER RESOURCES.						
Money received from the East-India Company, on account of Retired Pay, Pensions, &c. of his Majesty's Forces serving in the East Indies, per Act 4 Geo. 4, c. 71.....	60,000	0	0	..	..	
Surplus of his Majesty's Hereditary Revenue, Scotland, per Act 4 Geo. IV. c. 41, s. 9 .....	20,000	0	0	..	..	
Surplus of the 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub> per cent Duties .....	23,860	0	8	..	..	
Imprest Monies, repaid by sundry Public Accountants, and other Monies paid to the Public.....	34,094	18	2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	..	..	
Amount of Savings on the Third Class of the Civil List .....	25,692	16	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	..	..	
Money brought from the Civil List, on account of the Salary of Lord Warden of the Cinque Ports .....	2,973	12	6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	..	..	
TOTALS of the Public Income of the United Kingdom ....	59,308,872	2	0 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	4,497,547	2	2



## FOR THE YEAR 1831.

CLASS IV. UNFUNDED DEBT.

V. PUBLIC FUNDED DEBT.

VI. TRADE AND NAVIGATION.

FOR THE YEAR ENDED 5TH JANUARY, 1831.

NETT RECEIPT within the Year, after deducting REPAYMENTS &c.	TOTAL INCOME, including BALANCES.	Charges of Collection, and other Payments out of the Income, in its Progress to the Exchequer.	PAYMENTS into the EXCHEQUER.	BALANCES and BILLS Outstanding on 5th January, 1831.	Rate per Cent for which the Gross Receipt was col- lected.
£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.	£. s. d.
19,527,100 14 1	20,054,693 11 2 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	1,856,456 19 0 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	17,540,822 14 10	657,913 17 4	6 2 10
19,817,381 18 7	20,732,432 15 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1,381,503 10 10 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	18,644,384 19 3	706,544 5 9 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	5 8 5
7,248,083 14 6	7,519,730 9 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	190,159 7 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7,058,121 4 0	271,449 18 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	2 10 4
5,294,870 6 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5,413,143 13 4	303,918 5 8 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	5,013,405 3 8 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	95,790 3 11	5 6 4
2,212,206 5 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	2,375,925 10 0	737,914 10 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1,466,011 18 6	171,999 0 9	30 3 4
52,351 16 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	55,643 11 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	1,291 0 3	51,226 14 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	3,125 17 5	2 9 3
67,925 19 9	68,131 3 11	9,833 18 10	58,088 0 0	159 5 1	14 11 0
363,742 0 4	436,695 1 9 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	391,422 12 2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	45,273 9 7 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	7 13 9
7,260 2 7	7,999 17 3 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	3,093 17 0	4,653 11 2	252 9 1 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	15 1 1
44,684 3 9	44,684 3 9	.. ..	44,684 3 9	.. ..	..
9,096 9 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	9,096 9 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.. ..	9,096 9 1 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	.. ..	..
54,644,703 11 11 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	56,718,177 7 9 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	4,875,674 1 9 <sup>7</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	49,839,994 18 5 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>2</sub>	1,952,508 7 5 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	6 5 7
60,000 0 0	60,000 0 0	.. ..	60,000 0 0	.. ..	..
20,000 0 0	20,000 0 0	.. ..	20,000 0 0	.. ..	..
23,860 0 8	23,860 0 8	.. ..	23,860 0 8	.. ..	..
34,094 18 2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	34,094 18 2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	34,094 18 2 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	..
25,692 16 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	25,692 16 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	25,692 16 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	..
2,973 12 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	2,973 12 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	2,973 12 6 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	.. ..	..
54,811,324 19 10 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	56,884,798 15 7 <sup>7</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	4,875,674 1 9 <sup>7</sup> / <sub>8</sub>	50,056,616 6 4 <sup>1</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	1,952,508 7 5 <sup>3</sup> / <sub>4</sub>	..



## PUBLIC EXPENDITURE

Of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland in the Year  
ended 5th January, 1831.

EXPENDITURE.					
			£.	s.	d.
<i>Payments out of the Income in its Progress to the Exchequer.</i>					
Charges of Collection .....	3,713,944	0	3 $\frac{3}{4}$		
Other Payments .....	1,161,730	1	6 $\frac{1}{8}$		
Total Payments out of the Income, prior to the Payments into the Exchequer	4,875,674	1	9		
<i>Funded Debt.</i>					
Interest and Management of the Permanent Debt.....	25,466,557	7	11 $\frac{1}{4}$		
Terminable Annuities .....	2,859,269	14	9		
Total Charge of the Funded Debt, exclusive of £.5,307 2s. 11d. the Interest on Donations and Bequests .....	28,325,827	2	8 $\frac{1}{4}$		
<i>Unfunded Debt.</i>					
Interest on Exchequer Bills .....	793,031	1	8		
Civil List, to 26th June 1830, charged on the Consolidated Fund.....	502,365	7	8 $\frac{1}{4}$		
Civil List Charges, paid out of the Grant of £.200,000, for defraying the Charge up to 5th January 1831.....	160,415	3	11 $\frac{3}{4}$		
Civil List, chargeable on the Hereditary Reve- nue of the Crown .....	236,879	11	7 $\frac{1}{2}$		
	899,660	3	3 $\frac{1}{2}$		
PAYABLE IN					
ENGLAND.					
	£.	s.	d.		
Pensions on the Consolidated Fund .....	370,018	2	3 $\frac{3}{4}$		
Salaries and Allowances, do.	66,680	10	11		
Courts of Justice, do. ....	145,724	0	7 $\frac{1}{4}$		
Miscellaneous Charges, do...	225,942	12	8		
Mint Establishment, do. ....					
Bounties granted for the establishment of Hemp and Flax in Scotland, per 27 Geo. III. c. 13, s. 65.....					
Army .....	6,991,163	7	4 $\frac{1}{4}$		
Navy .....	5,309,605	17	5		
Ordnance .....	1,613,908	0	0		
Miscellaneous chargeable upon annual Grants of Parliament....	1,950,108	13	4		
Money paid to the Bank of England, to supply deficiencies in the Balance received for Unclaimed Dividends, per Act 56 Geo. 3, c. 97 .....					
Surplus of Income paid into the Exchequer, over Expenditure issued thereout					



## DISPOSITION OF GRANTS.

An Account showing how the MONIES given for the SERVICE of the United Kingdom of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, for the Year 1830, have been disposed of; distinguished under their several Heads; to 5th January, 1831.

SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
NAVY .....	5,594,955	5	8	4,270,096	9	1
ORDNANCE .....	1,689,444	0	0	1,105,000	0	0
FORCES.....	7,403,651	2	4½	5,823,284	1	6
For defraying the Charge of the Royal Military College; for the year 1830 .....	7,656	19	6	7,656	19	6
For defraying the Charge of the Royal Military Asylum; for the year 1830.....	20,986	13	3	8,166	7	9
For defraying the Charge of the Civil Contingencies; for the year 1830 .....	160,000	0	0	96,664	17	1
To defray the Expense of Works executing at the Royal Harbour of George the Fourth at Kingstown; for the year 1830.....	20,000	0	0	—		
To defray the Salaries and Allowances to the Officers of the Houses of Lords and Commons; for the year 1830.....	30,500	0	0	26,500	0	0
To defray the Expenses of the Houses of Lords and Commons; for the year 1830 ...	17,000	0	0	17,000	0	0
To make good the Deficiency of the Fee Fund, in the Department of his Majesty's Treasury; for the year 1830 .....	24,000	0	0	11,000	0	0
Ditto - - Home Secretary of State; for the year 1830.....	12,010	0	0	12,010	0	0
Ditto - - Foreign - - - ditto; for the year 1830 .....	17,000	0	0	17,000	0	0
Ditto - - Secretary of State for the Colonies; for the year 1830.....	17,500	0	0	17,000	0	0
Ditto - - most Honourable Privy Council, and Committee of Privy Council for Trade; for the year 1830 .....	16,858	0	0	16,858	0	0
To defray the Contingent Expenses and Messengers' Bills in the Department of his Majesty's Treasury; for the year 1830.....	8,000	0	0	8,000	0	0
Ditto - - Home Secretary of State; for the year 1830 .....	8,045	0	0	5,700	0	0
Ditto - - Foreign - - - ditto; for the year 1830 .....	34,750	0	0	34,750	0	0
Ditto - - Secretary of State for the Colonies; for the year 1830 .....	10,500	0	0	7,000	0	0
Ditto - - most Honourable Privy Council and Committee of Privy Council for Trade; for the year 1830 .....	3,725	0	0	3,335	17	1



SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
To defray the Salaries to certain Officers, and the Expenses of the Court and Receipt of Exchequer; for the year 1830.....	5,000	0	0	5,000	0	0
To pay the Salaries or Allowances granted to certain Professors in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, for reading Courses of Lectures; for the year 1830 .....	958	5	0	958	5	0
To pay the Salaries of the Commissioners of the Insolvent Debtors Court, of their Clerks, and the Contingent Expenses of their Office, and also the Expenses attendant upon their Circuits; for the year 1830 ...	13,778	2	0	6,310	0	0
To pay in the year 1830, the Salaries of the Officers, and the Contingent Expenses of the Office for the Superintendence of Aliens, and also the Superannuation or retired Allowances to Officers formerly employed in that Service .....	4,034	0	0	4,034	0	0
To pay the usual Allowances to Protestant Dissenting Ministers in England, poor French Protestant Refugee Clergy, poor French Refugee Laity, and sundry small Charitable and other Allowances to the Poor of St. Martin-in-the-Fields, and others; for the year 1830.....	5,712	7	10	2,956	3	11
To defray the Expense of Printing Acts, and Bills, Reports and other Papers for the two Houses of Parliament; for the year 1830 .....	76,000	0	0	50,250	13	10
To defray the Expense of Printing, under the direction of the Commissioners of Public Records; for the year 1830 .....	8,000	0	0	7,289	17	3
To defray the Extraordinary Expenses of the Mint, in the Gold Coinage; in the year 1830 .....	19,000	0	0	19,000	0	0
To defray the Extraordinary Expenses that may be incurred for Prosecutions, &c. relating to the Coin of this Kingdom; for the year 1830 .....	7,000	0	0	7,000	0	0
To defray the Expense of Law Charges; for the year 1830 .....	15,000	0	0	10,000	0	0
To defray the Expenses incurred for the support of captured Negroes, &c. for the year 1830; under the several Acts for the Abolition of the Slave Trade .....	35,000	0	0	35,000	0	0
To defray in the year 1830, the Amount of Bills drawn from New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, on account of the Expenditure incurred for Convicts in those Settlements .....	120,000	0	0	—		
Towards satisfying such Annuities, Pensions or other Payments, as would have been payable out of the Consolidated Fund of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and						



SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Ireland, or out of the Civil List, in case the demise of his late Majesty had not taken place before the 5th day of January 1831 .....	300,000	0	0	160,415	3	11 $\frac{3}{4}$
For Repairs and Improvements of Windsor Castle; for the year 1830 .....	100,000	0	0	—		
For the Rideau Canal; for the year 1830 ...	163,000	0	0	122,250	0	0
The following SERVICES are directed to be paid without any Fee or other Deduction whatsoever :						
For defraying the CHARGE of the CIVIL ESTABLISHMENTS undermentioned ; viz.						
Of the Bahama Islands ; for the year 1830...	3,040	0	0	2,400	0	0
Of Nova Scotia ; for the year 1830.....	10,445	0	0	9,600	0	0
Of New Brunswick ; for the year 1830 .....	3,600	0	0	1,500	0	0
Of the Island of Bermuda ; for the year 1830	4,000	0	0	4,000	0	0
Of Prince Edward's Island ; for the year 1830 .....	3,880	0	0	3,510	0	0
Of the Island of Newfoundland ; for the year 1830 .....	11,261	0	0	6,000	0	0
Of Sierra Leone ; for the year 1830 .....	10,180	15	10	—		
To defray the Expense of the Establishment at Fernandez Po ; for the year 1830 .....	3,601	14	0	1,000	0	0
To defray the Expense of the Forts at Cape Coast Castle and Accra ; for the year 1830	4,000	0	0	—		
To defray the estimated Expenditure of the British Museum ; for the year ending at Christmas 1830.....	16,143	0	0	16,143	0	0
To defray the Expense of Works and Repairs of Public Buildings, and for Furniture and other Charges defrayed by the Office of Works ; for the year 1830 .....	32,500	0	0	10,664	17	6
To defray the Expense of Works executing at Port Patrick Harbour ; for the year 1830	7,000	0	0	7,000	0	0
Ditto - - Donaghadee Harbour ; for the year 1830 .....	8,000	0	0	8,000	0	0
Towards defraying the Expense of erecting Churches in the West Indies ; for the year 1830 .....	6,000	0	0	6,000	0	0
Ditto - - and completing the Pier at Hobb's Point, Milford Haven .....	8,000	0	0	—		
Ditto - - the State Paper Office ; for the year 1830 .....	12,000	0	0	—		
To defray the Expenses of the Commissioners of the Holyhead and Howth Roads and Harbours .....	4,700	0	0	4,700	0	0
To defray the Expense of the New Buildings at the British Museum ; for the year 1830	10,000	0	0	5,665	18	5
To make Compensation to the Commissioners appointed by several Acts for inquiring into						



SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
the Collection and Management of the Revenue in Ireland, and into certain Revenue Departments in Great Britain, for their assiduity, care and pains in the execution of the Trusts reposed in them by Parliament.	6,500	0	0	6,500	0	0
To defray the Charge of Retired Allowances or Superannuations to Persons formerly employed in Public Offices or Departments, or in the Public Service; for the year 1830	6,882	12	7	2,446	17	7
To grant relief, in the year 1830, to Toulonese and Corsican Emigrants, Dutch Naval Officers, Saint Domingo Sufferers, and others who have heretofore received Allowances from his Majesty, and who from Services performed or Losses sustained in the British Service, have special Claims upon his Majesty's justice and liberality .....	13,647	10	0	6,697	10	0
To defray the Expense of the National Vaccine Establishment; for the year 1830 ...	2,500	0	0	2,500	0	0
To defray the Expense of the Establishment of the Penitentiary House at Milbank; for the year 1830 .....	21,135	0	0	10,000	0	0
For the support of the Institution called The Refuge for the Destitute; for the year 1830 .....	3,000	0	0	3,000	0	0
For the relief of American Loyalists; for the year 1830 .....	4,000	0	0	3,000	0	0
To defray the Expense of confining and maintaining Criminal Lunatics; for the year 1830 .....	3,039	0	0	2,958	7	11
For his Majesty's Foreign and other Secret Services; for the year 1830 .....	45,000	0	0	44,600	0	0
To defray the Expense of providing Stationery, Printing and Binding for the several Public Departments of Government for the year 1830, including the Expense of the Establishment of the Stationery Office.	96,850	0	0	60,000	0	0
To defray the Expense attending the confining, maintaining, and employing Convicts at Home and at Bermuda; for the year 1830 ... ..	107,986	0	0	107,986	0	0
To pay in the year 1830, the Salaries and incidental Expenses of the Commissioners appointed on the part of his Majesty, under the Treaties with Spain and Portugal and the Netherlands, for preventing the illegal traffic in Slaves.....	18,700	0	0	5,000	0	0
To defray the Expense of Missions and Special Commissions to the new States of America; for the year 1830 .....	28,000	0	0	11,866	1	6½
To pay the Salaries of Consuls General and Consuls, their contingent Expenses and Superannuation Allowances to retired Consuls; for the year 1830 .....	87,970	0	0	34,445	10	2¼



SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
To pay in the year 1830, the Fees due and payable to the Officers of the Parliament on all Bills for continuing or amending any Acts for making and maintaining, keeping in repair or improving, Turnpike Roads, which shall pass the two Houses of Parliament, and receive the Royal Assent.	9,000	0	0	9,000	0	0
To defray, in the year 1830, the Salaries and Expenses of the Commissioners, appointed to inquire into the Practice and Proceedings of the Superior Courts of Common Law, and into the Law of England respecting Real Property.....	16,600	0	0	16,600	0	0
To defray the Expenses of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in certain of his Majesty's Colonies; for the year 1830.....	16,182	0	0	16,019	10	0
To defray the Charge in the year 1830, for providing Stores for the Engineer Department in New South Wales and Van Diemen's Land, Bedding and Clothing for the Convicts, Clothing and Tools for the Liberated Africans at Sierra Leone, and Indian presents for Canada .....	47,500	0	0	47,500	0	0
For the Protestant Charter Schools of Ireland	8,950	0	0	6,712	10	0
For the Association for Discountenancing Vice in Ireland.....	5,000	0	0	3,750	0	0
For the Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor of Ireland .. .....	25,000	0	0	25,000	0	0
For the Foundling Hospital of Dublin .....	30,900	0	0	30,900	0	0
For the House of Industry in Dublin .....	21,295	0	0	15,000	0	0
For the Richmond Lunatic Asylum.....	6,700	0	0	6,700	0	0
For the Hibernian Society for Soldiers' Children .....	7,596	0	0	7,596	0	0
For the Hibernian Marine Society .....	1,400	0	0	1,400	0	0
For the Female Orphan House in Dublin ...	1,375	0	0	1,375	0	0
For the Westmorland Lock Hospital in Dublin .....	3,060	0	0	3,060	0	0
For the Lying-in Hospital in Dublin .....	2,591	0	0	1,943	5	0
For Doctor Steevens's Hospital in Dublin ...	1,676	0	0	1,257	0	0
For the Fever Hospital in Cork-street, Dublin	3,860	0	0	2,895	0	0
For the Hospital for Incurables in Dublin ...	465	0	0	348	15	0
For the Roman Catholic Seminary at Maynooth.....	8,928	0	0	6,696	0	0
For the Royal Cork Institution .....	600	0	0	450	0	0
For the Royal Dublin Society.....	7,000	0	0	7,000	0	0
For the Royal Irish Academy .....	300	0	0	300	0	0
For the Commissioners of Charitable Donations and Bequests in Ireland .....	700	0	0	—		
For the Belfast Academical Institution .....	1,500	0	0	1,125	0	0
For the Board of Works in Ireland .....	13,780	0	0	3,461	13	11
For Printing, Stationery, &c. in the Chief Secretary's Office in Ireland .....	14,500	6	0	10,448	11	5
For Printing Proclamations and Statutes in Ireland .....	4,600	0	0	3,702	5	9



SERVICES.	SUMS Voted or Granted.			SUMS Paid.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
For Criminal Prosecutions in Ireland .....	50,000	0	0	48,200	0	0
For Non-conforming and other Dissenting Ministers in Ireland .....	14,860	6	0	9,676	3	0
For Salaries to Lottery Officers in Ireland...	740	0	2	394	6	0 $\frac{3}{4}$
For Inland Navigations in Ireland .....	5,300	0	0	3,975	0	0
For the Police of Dublin .....	23,000	0	0	23,000	0	0
For the Commissioners of Judicial Inquiry in Ireland .....	7,328	6	2	5,407	5	1
For the Board of Public Records in Ireland.	2,909	0	0	2,909	0	0
For the Public Works in Ireland .....	11,000	0	0	11,000	0	0
To pay Interest on Exchequer Bills for the year 1830.....	750,000	0	0	720,873	0	2
	17,698,762	6	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	13,360,346	4	6 $\frac{1}{4}$
To pay off and discharge Exchequer Bills, and that the same be issued and applied to- wards paying off and discharging any Ex- chequer Bills charged on the Aids or Sup- plies of the years 1829 and 1830, now re- maining unpaid or unprovided for .....	25,438,800	0	0	24,563,450	0	0
To pay off and discharge Exchequer Bills, issued pursuant to several Acts for carrying on Public Works and Fisheries, and for building additional Churches, outstanding and unprovided for .....	168,800	0	0			
	43,306,362	6	4 $\frac{1}{2}$	37,923,796	4	6 $\frac{1}{4}$



## PAYMENTS FOR OTHER SERVICES,

Not being part of the Supplies granted for the Service of the Year.

	Sums Paid to 5th January, 1831.	Estimated further Payments.
	£.    s.    d.	£.    s.    d.
Grosvenor Charles Bedford, Esq. on his Salary, for additional trouble in preparing Exchequer Bills, pursuant to Act 48 Geo. 3, c. 1 .....	150    0    0	50    0    0
Expenses in the office of the Commissioners for issuing Exchequer Bills, pursuant to Acts 57 Geo. 3, c. 34 and 124, and 3 Geo. 4, c. 86 .....	2,000    0    0	
Expenses in the office of the Commissioners for issuing Exchequer Bills for building Churches, per Act 58 Geo. 3, c. 45 .....	3,000    0    0	
Paid to the Bank of England, more than received from them, to make up their Balance on account of Unclaimed Dividends.	127,399    16    10	
	<u>132,549    16    10</u>	132,549    16    10
TOTAL Payments for Services not voted .....		<u>132,599    16    10</u>
Amount of Sums voted .....		<u>43,306,362    6    4½</u>
TOTAL Sums voted, and Payments for Services not voted .. .....		<u><u>43,438,962    3    2½</u></u>



## WAYS AND MEANS

for answering the foregoing Services :

	£.	s.	d.
Duty on Sugar, per Act 1 Will. 4, c. 50.....	3,000,000	0	0
East India Company, per Act 11 Geo. 4, c. 4.....	60,000	0	0
Sum to be brought from the Consolidated Fund, per Act 11 Geo. 4, c. 2. ....	4,000,000	0	0
- - - - - Ditto - - - - - 28.....	4,000,000	0	0
- - - - - Ditto - - - - - 1 Will. 4, c. 63.....	1,500,000	0	0
- - - - - Ditto - - - - - 1.....	3,000,000	0	0
- - - - - Ditto - - - - - 5.....	1,850,000	0	0
Interest on Land Tax redeemed by Stock or Money .....	6,027	15	1 $\frac{1}{4}$
Repayments by the Commissioners for issuing Exchequer Bills for carrying on Public Works and Fisheries in the United Kingdom .....	253,221	3	11
Surplus Ways and Means, per Act 11 Geo. 4, c. 4.....	80,528	17	4
	17,749,777	16	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
Exchequer Bills voted in Ways and Means ; viz.			
Per Act 11 Geo. 4, c. 3.....	£.12,000,000	0	0
1 Will. 4, c. 62 .....	13,607,600	0	0
	25,607,600	0	0
TOTAL Ways and Means .....	43,357,377	16	4 $\frac{1}{4}$
TOTAL Grants and Payments for Services not voted .....	43,438,962	3	2 $\frac{1}{2}$
Deficiency of Ways and Means .....	81,584	6	10 $\frac{1}{4}$



# UNFUNDED DEBT.

AN Account of the UNFUNDED DEBT of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, and of the Demands outstanding on 5th January, 1831.

	Provided.			Unprovided.			TOTAL.		
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.
Exchequer Bills, (exclusive of £ 45,350 and £ 1,662,000 issued for paying off £ 4 per cents).....	-	-	-	25,616,400	0	0	25,616,400	0	0
The amount of Exchequer Bills outstanding, issued in pursuance of Act 11 Geo. 4, c. 26, for paying off Proprietors of £ 4 per cent Annuities, on 5th January, 1831, was .....	-	-	-	1,662,000	0	0	1,662,000	0	0
Sums remaining unpaid, charged upon aids granted by Parliament.....	4,543,328	0	6	27,278,400	0	0	27,278,400	0	0
Advances made out of the Consolidated Fund in Ireland, towards the Supplies which are to be repaid to the Consolidated Fund, out of the Ways and Means in Great Britain .....	257,755	5	11½	-	-	-	257,755	5	11½
TOTAL Unfunded Debt, and Demands outstanding.....	4,801,083	6	5½	27,278,400	0	0	32,079,483	6	5½
Ways and Means .....	4,894,645	3	6¼	-	-	-	-	-	-
SURPLUS Ways and Means .....	93,561	17	0¾	-	-	-	-	-	-
Exchequer Bills to be issued to complete the Charge upon the Consolidated Fund..	-	-	-	4,327,966	16	0	4,327,966	16	0



## PUBLIC

## Of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND, and the

## DEBT.

	1. CAPITALS.	2. CAPITALS transferred to the Commissioners.	3. CAPITALS UNREDEEMED.
<b>GREAT BRITAIN.</b>			
Debt due to the South Sea Company at £. 3 per cent	£. 3,662,784 8 6	£. - - -	£. 3,662,784 8 6
Old South Sea Annuities Do. ....	3,501,870 2 7	- - -	3,501,870 2 7
New South Sea Annuities Do. ....	2,489,830 2 10	- - -	2,489,830 2 10
South Sea Annuities, 1751 Do. ....	527,100 0 0	- - -	627,100 0 0
Debt due to the Bank of England Do. ....	14,686,800 0 0	- - -	14,686,800 0 0
Bank Annuities, created in 1726 Do. ....	876,494 0 0	444 1 0	876,049 19 0
Consolidated Annuities Do. ....	349,483,757 13 8	655,096 18 2	348,828,660 15 6
Reduced Annuities Do. ....	124,491,472 2 7	719,581 3 5	123,771,890 19 2
Total at £. 3 per cent..	499,720,108 10 2	1,375,122 2 7	498,344,986 7 7
Annuities .. .. at £. 3½ per cent..	12,804,559 2 2	- - -	12,804,559 2 2
Reduced Annuities .. .. do. ....	64,259,806 0 1	9,424 18 2	64,250,381 1 11
New 3½ per cent Annuities .. ..	138,690,227 1 0	9,259 15 9	138,680,967 5 3
Annuities created 1826, at 4 per cent .. ..	10,806,966 0 0	- - -	10,806,966 0 0
New £. 5 per cent Annuities .. ..	467,712 19 11	- - -	467,712 19 11
Great Britain.....	726,749,379 13 5	1,393,806 16 6	725,355,572 16 11
<b>IN IRELAND.</b>			
Irish Consolidated £. 3 per cent Annuities.	2,455,317 13 6	- - -	2,455,317 13 6
Irish Reduced £. 3 per cent Annuities ....	150,228 17 10	- - -	150,228 17 10
£. 3½ per cent Debentures and Stock .. ..	14,173,495 7 1	- - -	14,173,495 7 1
Reduced £. 3½ per cent Annuities .. ..	1,289,703 17 10	- - -	1,289,703 17 10
New 3½ per cent Annuities .. ..	11,425,247 18 8	- - -	11,425,247 18 8
Debt due to the Bank of Ireland, at £. 4 per cent .. ..	1,615,384 12 4	- - -	1,615,384 12 4
New £. 5 per cent Annuities .. ..	6,661 1 0	- - -	6,661 1 0
Debt due to the Bank of Ireland, at £. 5 per cent .. ..	1,015,384 12 4	- - -	1,015,384 12 4
Ireland.....	32,131,424 0 7	- - -	32,131,424 0 7
Total United Kingdom.....	758,880,803 14 0	1,393,806 16 6	757,486,996 17 6

The Act 10 Geo. IV. c. 27, which came into operation at the 5th July, 1829, enacts, That the Sum thenceforth annually applicable to the Reduction of the National Debt of the United Kingdom, shall be the Sum which shall appear to be the amount of the whole actual annual surplus Revenue, beyond the Expenditure of the said United Kingdom; And the following Sums have been accordingly issued to the Commissioners to be applied to the reduction of the said Debt, including Interest receivable on account of Donations and Bequests:—

	£.	s.	d.	
At 6th April 1830.....	428,187	1	6	.... includes 300l. received from A. H. C.
6th July 1830 .....	352,057	12	6	
11th October 1830.....	584,383	11	6	
5th January 1831.....	747,631	2	9	.... 29l. 14s. 1d. further Legacy from the Executors received of the late Admiral Peter Rainer.
	2,112,259	8	3	



FUNDED DEBT.

CHARGE thereupon, at the 5th January, 1831.

CHARGE.						
		IN GREAT BRITAIN.		IN IRELAND.		TOTAL ANNUAL CHARGE
		£.	s. d.	£.	s. d.	£. s. d.
Due to the Public Creditor.	Annual Interest on Unredeemed Capital .....	22,956,770	13 4	1,134,979	14 5	
	Long Annuities, expire 1860 .....	1,193,089	9 7	—		
	Annuities per 4 Geo. 4, c. 22, do. 1867.....	585,740	0 0	—		
	Annuities per 10 Geo. 4, c. 24, expire at various periods ..	775,914	5 0	—		
	Annuities to the Trustees of the Waterloo Subscription Fund, per 59 Geo. 3, c. 34, expire 5th July, 1831.....	7,300	0 0	—		
	Life Annuities per 48 Geo. 3, c. 142, and 10 Geo. 4, c. 24.	669,361	9 0	—		
	Life Annuities } English ..	23,455	8 2	—		
	payable at the Exchequer. } Irish ....	35,476	18 7	7,038	0 9	
		26,247,108	3 9	1,142,017	15 2	
	Annual Interest on Stock transferred to the Commissioners for the Reduction of the National Debt, towards the Redemption of Land Tax, under Schedules C. D. 1 and D 2, 53 Geo. 3, c. 123.....	10,449	12 6	—		
Management.....		275,179	3 4	—		
Total Annual Charge.....		26,532,736	19 7	1,142,017	15 2	27,674,754 14 9

ABSTRACT.  
(\* \* \* Shillings and Pence omitted.)

	CAPITALS.	CAPITALS transferred to the Commissioners	CAPITALS unredeemed.	ANNUAL CHARGE.		
				Due to the Public Creditor	Management.	TOTAL.
	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.	£.
Great Britain ..	726,749,379	1,393,806	725,355,572	26,257,557	275,179	26,532,736
Ireland .....	32,131,424	—	32,131,424	1,142,017	—	1,142,017
	758,880,803	* 1,393,806	757,486,996	27,399,575	275,179	27,674,754

£. s. d.		DEFERRED ANNUITIES OUTSTANDING:		£. s. d.	
* On account of Donations and Bequests..	181,366 0 0	Deferred Life Annuities, per 10 Geo. 4, c. 24 .....		1,788	12 0
Do. of Stock unclaimed 10 years or upwards.	224,719 14 8	Deferred Annuities for terms of years, per do. ....		20	0 0
Do. of Unclaimed Dividends .....	639,400 0 0			in 1832 ....	6,200 0 0
	1,045,485 14 8	Payable to the Trustees of the Waterloo Fund, per 59 Geo. 3, c. 34 .....		— 1833 ....	7,900 0 0
Do. of Land Tax, Schedules C. D 1; and D 2 .....	348,321 1 10			— 1834 ....	6,300 0 0
	1,393,806 16 6			— 1835 ....	4,000 0 0
				— 1836 ....	9,000 0 0
				— 1837 ....	2,900 0 0
					38,108 12 0



## TRADE OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

AN Account of the VALUE of IMPORTS into, and of EXPORTS from, the United Kingdom of GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND:—Also, the Amount of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported therefrom, according to the Real or Declared Value thereof.

YEARS ending 5th January.	VALUE OF IMPORTS, calculated at the Official Rates of Valuation.			VALUE OF EXPORTS, calculated at the Official Rates of Valuation.						VALUE of the Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom Exported therefrom, according to the Real and Declared Value thereof.					
				Produce and Manufactures of the United Kingdom.		Foreign and Colonial Merchandise.		TOTAL EXPORTS.							
	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.	£.	s.	d.						
1829.....	45,028,805	10	1	52,797,455	2	1	9,946,545	12	3	62,744,000	14	4	36,814,176	5	3
1830.....	43,981,317	1	11	56,213,041	15	8	10,622,402	12	4	66,835,444	8	0	35,830,469	14	2
1831.....	46,245,241	6	6	61,140,864	15	10	8,550,437	15	9	69,691,302	11	7	38,251,502	10	3

*Note.*—The British and Irish Records of Commerce having been incorporated together, under an arrangement which took effect at the commencement of 1830, the separate Accounts of the Trade of Great Britain and Ireland, which in former years were in the Finance Accounts appended to this Statement, have been discontinued.



# NAVIGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

**NEW VESSELS BUILT.**—Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE, that were built and registered in the several Ports of the BRITISH EMPIRE, in the Years ending the 5th January 1829, 1830, and 1831, respectively.

	Year ending 5th Jan. 1829.		Year ending 5th Jan. 1830.		Year ending 5th Jan. 1831.	
	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.	Vessels.	Tonnage.
United Kingdom.....	842	88,663	718	76,635	730	75,532
Isles Guernsey, Jersey, and Man .....	15	1,406	16	1,000	20	1,879
British Plantations .....	464	50,844	416	39,237	289	25,630
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<b>1,321</b>	<b>140,913</b>	<b>1,150</b>	<b>116,872</b>	<b>1,039</b>	<b>103,041</b>

*Note.*—The Account delivered last year (for the year ending 5th January 1830), is now corrected; and as several Returns from the Plantations for the year ending 5th January 1831 are not yet received, a similar correction will be necessary when the next Account is made up.

**VESSELS REGISTERED.**—Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE, and the Number of MEN and BOYS usually employed in Navigating the same, that belonged to the several Ports of the BRITISH EMPIRE, on the 31st of December, in the Years 1828, 1829, and 1830, respectively.

	On 31st Dec. 1828.			On 31st Dec. 1829.			On 31st Dec. 1830.		
	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.
United Kingdom .....	19,151	2,161,373	131,306	18,618	2,168,356	130,809	18,675	2,168,916	130,000
Isles Guernsey, Jersey, & Man.	495	31,927	3,763	492	31,603	3,707	499	32,676	3,649
British Plantations .....	4,449	324,891	20,507	4,343	317,041	20,292	4,547	330,227	21,163
<b>TOTAL .....</b>	<b>24,095</b>	<b>2,518,191</b>	<b>155,576</b>	<b>23,453</b>	<b>2,517,000</b>	<b>154,808</b>	<b>23,721</b>	<b>2,531,819</b>	<b>154,812</b>



NAVIGATION OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.—*continued.*

VESSELS EMPLOYED IN THE FOREIGN TRADE.—An Account of the Number of VESSELS, with the Amount of their TONNAGE, and the Number of MEN and BOYS employed in Navigating the same (including their repeated Voyages), that entered Inwards and cleared Outwards, at the several Ports of the United Kingdom, from and to Foreign Parts, during each of the Three Years ending 5th January, 1831.

YEARS ending 5th January.	SHIPPING ENTERED INWARDS IN THE UNITED KINGDOM, From Foreign Parts.							
	BRITISH AND IRISH VESSELS.			FOREIGN VESSELS.			TOTAL.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.
1829 . . . .	13,436	2,094,357	119,141	4,955	634,620	36,733	18,391	2,728,977
1830 . . . .	13,659	2,184,535	122,185	5,218	710,303	39,342	18,877	2,894,838
1831 . . . .	13,548	2,180,042	122,103	5,359	758,828	41,670	18,907	2,938,870

  

YEARS ending 5th January.	SHIPPING CLEARED OUTWARDS FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM, To Foreign Parts.							
	BRITISH AND IRISH VESSELS.			FOREIGN VESSELS.			TOTAL.	
	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Vessels.	Tons.	Men.	Tons.	Men.
1829 . . . .	12,248	2,006,397	119,143	4,405	608,118	33,246	16,653	2,614,515
1830 . . . .	12,636	2,063,179	119,262	5,094	730,250	38,527	17,730	2,793,429
1831 . . . .	12,747	2,102,147	122,025	5,158	758,368	39,769	17,905	2,860,515



## LIST OF GENERAL ACTS

*Passed in the FIRST Session of the NINTH Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—1 Will. IV.*

## 1 WILL. IV.

- I. AN Act to apply the sum of 3,000,000*l.* out of the Consolidated Fund, to the service of the year 1830.
- II. An Act to provide for the administration of the Government in case the Crown should descend to Her Royal Highness the Princess Alexandrina Victoria, daughter of his late Royal Highness the Duke of Kent, being under the age of eighteen years, and for the care and guardianship of her person.
- III. An Act to amend an Act of the last Session, for the better administration of Justice, so far as relates to the essoign and general return days of each Term, and to substitute other provisions in lieu thereof; and to declare the law with regard to the duration of the Terms in certain cases.
- IV. An Act to render valid Acts done by the governor of any of his Majesty's plantations after the expiration of his commission by the demise of his late Majesty, and to extend the period within which the patents of governors of colonies shall on any future demise of the Crown become vacant, and to provide for the longer duration of the patents of governors after the demise of the Crown.
- V. An Act to apply the sum of 1,850,000*l.* out of the consolidated fund, to the service of the year 1830; and to appropriate the supplies granted in this session of parliament.
- VI. An Act to continue for the term of six Calendar months, all such commissions, appointments, grants, or patents of offices or employments, civil or military, as were in force at the time of the demise of his late Majesty King George the Fourth, and as have not been superseded, determined, or made void during the reign of his present Majesty.
- VII. An Act for the more speedy judgment and execution in actions brought in his Majesty's courts of law at Westminster, and in the court of common pleas of the county palatine of Lancaster; and for amending the law as to judgment on a *cognovit actionem* in cases of bankruptcy.
- VIII. An Act for enabling his Majesty to appoint a postmaster general for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland: -
- IX. An Act to apply the sum of 5,000,000*l.* out of the consolidated fund, to the service of the year 1831.
- X. An Act for appropriating certain sums to the service of the year 1831.
- XI. An Act for raising the sum of 12,000,000*l.* by Exchequer bills, for the service of the year 1831.
- XII. An Act for continuing to his Majesty for one year, certain duties on personal estates, offices, and pensions in England, for the service of the year 1831.
- XIII. An Act to amend an Act passed in the eleventh year of the reign of his late Majesty, king George the Fourth, intituled An Act for appropriating the Richmond lunatic asylum in Dublin to the purposes of a district lunatic asylum.
- XIV. An Act for the regulation of his Majesty's royal marine forces while on shore.
- XV. An Act for punishing mutiny and desertion; and for the better payment of the army and their quarters.
- XVI. An Act to continue until the 5th day of July, 1832, an Act of the fifty-fourth year of his Majesty, king George the Third, for rendering the payment of creditors more equal and expeditious in Scotland.
- XVII. An Act to repeal the duties and drawbacks on printed calicoes, linens, and stuffs.
- XVIII. An Act to explain and amend



an Act of the sixth year of his late Majesty, king George the Fourth, as far as regards the settlement of the poor by the renting and occupation of tenements.

- XIX. An Act to extend the provisions of an Act of the fifty-fifth year of the reign of king George the Third, to provide for the taking an account of the population of Ireland, and for ascertaining the increase or diminution thereof.
- XX. An Act to explain and amend the laws relating to lands holden in free and common soccage in the province of Lower Canada.
- XXI. An Act to improve the proceedings in prohibition and on writs of mandamus.
- XXII. An Act to enable courts of law to order the examination of witnesses upon interrogatories and otherwise.
- XXIII. An Act for granting to his Majesty, until the 5th day of April, 1832, certain duties on sugar imported into the United Kingdom, for the service of the year 1830.
- XXIV. An Act to amend an Act of the sixth year of his late Majesty, to regulate the trade of the British possessions abroad.
- XXV. An Act for the support of his Majesty's household, and of the honour and dignity of the Crown of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland.
- XXVI. An Act to indemnify such persons in the United Kingdom as have omitted to qualify themselves for offices and employments, and for extending the time limited for those purposes respectively until the twenty-fifth day of March, 1832; to permit such persons in Great Britain as have omitted to make and file affidavits of the execution of indentures of clerks to attornies and solicitors to make and file the same on or before the first day of Hilary Term, 1832; and to allow persons to make and file such affidavits, although the persons whom they served shall have neglected to take out their annual certificates.
- XXVII. An Act for enabling his Majesty's postmaster General to sell the premises lately used as the post office in Lombard Street, Abchurch Lane, and Sherborne Lane, in the city of London.

## PUBLIC ACTS,

*Of a Local and Personal Nature,  
to be noticed by the Courts.*

- i. An Act for more effectually repairing and otherwise improving the road from Highgate in the county of Middlesex, through Whetstone, to Chipping Barnet in the county of Hertford, and the road from Chipping Barnet to the thirteen mile stone near Gannick Corner, in the Parish of South Mims, in the said county of Middlesex.
- ii. An Act for repairing, amending, and maintaining the roads from Marchwiell through Bangor, Worthenbury, and Hanmer, to Whitechurch, and from Bangor to Malpas, and from Redbrook to Hampton, in the counties of Denbigh, Flint, Chester, and Salop.
- iii. An Act for enlarging the powers of an Act passed in the tenth year of the reign of his late Majesty, for improving the approaches to London Bridge.
- iv. An Act to alter, amend, and enlarge the powers of an Act passed in the third year of the reign of his late Majesty, king George the Fourth, for regulating the poor of the city of Bristol, and for other purposes connected therewith.
- v. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from the powder mills on Hounslow Heath, in the county of Middlesex, to the twenty mile stone on Egham Hill, in the county of Surrey.
- vi. An Act for more effectually repairing and otherwise improving the road from the post road near Faversham, by Bacon's Water, through Ashford, to Hythe, and from Bacon's Water to Castle Street in the city of Canterbury, all in the county of Kent.
- vii. An Act for more effectually maintaining the road from Crossford Bridge to the town of Manchester, in the county palatine of Lancaster, and for making a branch road to communicate therewith.
- viii. An Act for repairing the road leading from Dartford to Sevenoaks, in the county of Kent.
- ix. An Act for repairing the road from Wimborne Minster to Blandford Forum, in the county of Dorset.
- x. An Act for repairing the road from Burton Bridge, in the county of Stafford, to Market Bosworth, in the county of Leicester.



- xi. An Act for repairing the road from Birmingham to Broomsgrove.
- xii. An Act for repairing the road from Measham, in the county of Derby, to Fieldon Bridge, in the county of Warwick, and other roads communicating therewith, in the counties of Derby, Leicester, and Warwick.
- xiii. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from the Rotherham and Mansfield turnpike road, at or near Clown, in the county of Derby, to the Worksop and Kelham turnpike road, at or near Budby, in the county of Nottingham.
- xiv. An Act for repairing the Watling Street road, the Manchester and Wolvey Heath road, and other roads communicating therewith, in the counties of Leicester and Warwick.
- xv. An Act for repairing the road from the Broken Cross in Macclesfield, to Nether Tabley, in the county of Chester.
- xvi. An Act to authorize the raising of further monies for supplying the town of Manchester with gas.
- xvii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road from Lower Saint Cross Mill Lane, on the road from the city of Winchester, to Southampton, to Park Gate, on the road from Southampton, to Gosport, in the county of Southampton.
- xviii. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Albion Street, in the town of Cheltenham, in the county of Gloucester, to Bunch Lane in or near the village of Bishop's Cleeve, in the said county, to join the turnpike road leading from the town of Evesham, in the county of Worcester, to the said town of Cheltenham.
- xix. An Act to enlarge the powers of an Act passed in the seventh year of the reign of his late Majesty, king George the Fourth, for establishing and well-governing the institution called "the School for the Indigent Blind," and for incorporating the subscribers thereto, and the better enabling them to carry on their charitable and useful designs.
- xx. An Act to amend an Act of the forty-seventh year of king George the Third, for enlarging the churchyard belonging to the parish of Saint Martin, in the town of Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, and for providing an additional cemetery or burial ground for the use of the said parish.
- xxi. An Act for the better assessing and recovering of the rates for the relief of the poor, and of the ecclesiastical or church rates, upon small tenements within the parish of Liverpool in the county palatine of Lancaster.
- xxii. An Act for raising a further sum of money to defray the outstanding claims in respect of the building the crypt and tower to the additional church erected in the parish of Saint Mary Magdalen, Bermondsey, in the county of Surrey, and of enclosing the burial ground thereof.
- xxiii. An Act for building a church or chapel, with a cemetery to the same, in the township of Liscard, in the parish of Wallasey, in the county palatine of Chester.
- xxiv. An Act for erecting a chapel in the parish of Saint Leonard's, within the liberty of the town and port of Hastings, in the county of Sussex, for the accommodation of the inhabitants of the said parish, and of the parish of Saint Mary Magdalen, within the said liberty and county.
- xxv. An Act for making and maintaining a pier or jetty, and other works, at Herne Bay, in the parish of Herne, in the county of Kent.
- xxvi. An Act for more effectually draining certain fen lands and wet grounds called the Great West Fen, in the parish of Hilgay, in the county of Norfolk.
- xxvii. An Act to amend an Act passed in the eleventh year of the reign of his late Majesty, king George the Fourth, intituled "An Act for improving the drainage of the lands lying in the north level, part of the great level of the fens called Bedford Level, and in Great Portsand, in the manor of Crowland, and for providing a navigation between Clows Cross and the Nene Outfall cut."
- xxviii. An Act for more effectually amending and widening the road from a place near the village of Milford, in the county of Surrey, through Haslemere, to the forty-third mile stone at Carpenter's Heath, and from thence to a bridge, near the Blue Bell Inn, over Houndley's Water, at the boundary of the said county of Surrey.
- xxix. An Act for amending and maintaining the turnpike road from and out of the road leading from Quebec in Leeds, to Homefield Lane End in Wortley, to communicate with the



- road leading from Huddersfield to Birstal, at the Coach and Horses public house in Birstal, in the West Riding of the county of York.
- xxx. An Act for amending and maintaining the roads from Stafford to Sandon, in the county of Stafford, and from Stafford, through Bridgford and Eccleshall, to Ireland's Cross near Woore, in the county of Salop, and from Bridgford aforesaid, to the stone which divides the liberty of Ranton and Ellenhall, in the road between Bridgford and Newport, and from the village of Knighton to the turnpike road leading from Stone to Woore aforesaid.
- xxxi. An Act for amending and improving the road from the town of Stone to Gaol Gate, in the borough of Stafford, and from Green Gate, in the said borough, through Dunston and Penkridge, to Streetway road, in the road leading to Wolverhampton, in the county of Stafford.
- xxxii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road from the city of Norwich to North Walsham, in the county of Norfolk.
- xxxiii. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Stopham Bridge, in the parish of Pulborough, to the direction post in the parish of Steyning, on the turnpike road leading from Steyning to Horsham, in the county of Sussex.
- xxxiv. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road from Liverpool to Preston, in the county palatine of Lancaster.
- xxxv. An Act for repairing and maintaining the road from Wakefield to Aberford, in the county of York.
- xxxvi. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the roads from Lemsford Mills, in the parish of Bishop's Hatfield, through Welwyn and Stevenage, to Hitchin, and from Welwyn, through Codicot, to Hitchin aforesaid, all in the county of Hertford.
- xxxvii. An Act for repairing, improving, and maintaining the roads from Bury, through Haslingden, to Blackburn and Whalley, and other roads communicating therewith, in the county palatine of Lancaster, and for making a new piece of road also to communicate therewith.
- xxxviii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road from the Leicester and Welford road, near Foston Lane, to the road leading from Hinckley to Ashby-de-la-Zouch; and for repairing Hunt's Lane and Wood Lane, in the parishes of Desford and Newbold, in the county of Leicester.
- xxxix. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Burton-upon-Trent, in the county of Stafford, to Abbott's Bromley, otherwise Bagot's Bromley, in the said county.
- xl. An Act for making and maintaining a turnpike road from the city of Coventry to Stoney Stanton, in the county of Leicester, to unite with the present turnpike road there, leading through Narborough to the borough of Leicester.
- xli. An Act for repairing the road from the city of Coventry to Over Whitacre, in the county of Warwick.
- xlii. An Act for more effectually repairing and maintaining the road over Horley Common, in the county of Surrey, to a place called Black Corner, and from thence to the Brighthelmston turnpike road at Cuckfield, in the county of Sussex.
- xliii. An Act for more effectually making and repairing the road from the new bridge over the water of Almond, on the confines of the counties of Edinburgh and Linlithgow, to Baillieston, in the county of Lanark, and certain branch roads connected therewith.
- xliv. An Act for improving the road from the Red House near Doncaster, to the south side of Wakefield Bridge, and from Wakefield to Pontefract, and from thence to Weeland, and from Pontefract to Wentbridge, all in the West Riding of the county of York.
- xlv. An Act for repairing and maintaining the road leading from the high road between Bromley and Farnborough, in the county of Kent, to Beggars Bush, in the turnpike road leading from Tonbridge Wells to Maresfield, in the county of Sussex.
- xlvi. An Act for improving and maintaining several roads leading to and from the town of Walsall, in the county of Stafford.
- xlvii. An Act for making a turnpike road from the north side of the Quarry House, in the township of Perry Barr, in the county of Stafford, to the brook which divides the parishes of Aston juxta Birmingham and Birmingham, in the county of Warwick.
- xlviii. An Act to alter and amend the several Acts now in force for the



- assessing, collecting, and levying of county rates, so far as the same relate to the county of Middlesex.
- xlix. An Act for better supplying with water the several Hamlets of Beard, Ollerset, Thornset, and Whittle, in the parish of Glossop, in the county of Derby.
- l. An Act for making the river Waveney navigable for ships and other seaborne vessels from Rosehall Fleet, to the mouth of Oulton Dyke; and for making and maintaining a navigable Cut from the said river at Carlton Shares Mill into the said dyke, leading to Oulton Broad, in the county of Suffolk.
- li. An Act for amending and enlarging the powers and provisions of the several Acts relating to the Liverpool and Manchester railway.
- lii. An Act for better supplying with water the several townships of Hyde, Werneth, and Newton, in the county palatine of Chester.
- liii. An Act for embanking, draining, improving, and preserving certain fen lands and low grounds lying in the parish of Yaxley, in the county of Huntingdon, called "the Undrained Fen."
- liv. An Act to enlarge and amend the powers and provisions of the several Acts relating to the Birmingham and Liverpool Junction Canal, and to better supply the said canal with water.
- lv. An Act to consolidate and extend the powers and provisions of the several Acts relating to the navigation from the Trent to the Mersey.
- lvi. An Act for making and maintaining a railway from the borough of Wigan to the borough of Preston, both in the county palatine of Lancaster, and collateral branches to communicate therewith.
- lvii. An Act for taking down the parish church of Great Marlow, in the county of Buckingham, and for rebuilding the same on or near the present site thereof.
- lviii. An Act for more effectually keeping in repair several roads in the county of Carmarthen, usually called the Llandovery district of the Lampeter roads, and for making and maintaining certain new lines of road to communicate therewith.
- lix. An Act for more effectually keeping in repair the roads from Ludlowfach to the town of Llandovery, and from thence to the river Amman, in the county of Carmarthen, and several other roads in the said county communicating therewith, and for making new branches of road in the same county and in the county of Glamorgan.
- lx. An Act for maintaining the road from Enfield Chase, in the county of Middlesex, to Lemsford Mill, in the county of Hertford.
- lxi. An Act for maintaining and improving the road from Titchfield to Cosham, in the county of Southampton.
- lxii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the roads called "the Pucklechurch, or lower district of roads," in the counties of Gloucester and Wilts.
- lxiii. An Act for repairing the turnpike road from the Salutation Inn to Christian Malford Bridge, in the county of Wilts, called the Draycot or Upper District; and for disuniting the same road from a certain other road called the Pucklechurch Lower District, in the county of Gloucester.
- lxiv. An Act for more effectually repairing and keeping in repair the road from Carlowrie Bridge, on the river Almond, to Linlithgow Bridge, on the river Avon and other roads in the county of Linlithgow.
- lxv. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Bishopsgate Bridge, in the city of Norwich, to the Caister Causeway, in the county of Norfolk.
- lxvi. An Act for more effectually repairing several roads in and near the town of Bruton, and other roads in the counties of Somerset and Wilts, and for making and maintaining two other roads communicating therewith.
- lxvii. An Act for more effectually repairing, widening, and otherwise improving the road from the south-east end of the town of Loughborough, in the county of Leicester, commencing at South Field Lane, to the south end of Cavendish Bridge, in the same county.
- lxviii. An Act for consolidating the trusts of the several turnpike roads in the neighbourhood of Cheadle, in the county of Stafford, and for making deviations and new branches to and from the same.
- lxix. An Act to amend an Act of the seventh and eighth years of his late



Majesty, for the more effectually repairing and otherwise improving the roads in the county of Glamorgan.

lxx. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the roads from

Tunbridge Wells, in the county of Kent, to the Cross Ways, at or near Maresfield Street, and from Florence Farm to Forest Row, in the county of Sussex.

## GENERAL ACTS

*Passed in the FIRST Session of the TENTH Parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland—1 and 2 Will. IV. 1831.*

- I. An Act for repealing so much of an act passed in the seventh year of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for paving lighting, watching, repairing, and otherwise improving Grosvenor Place, and other streets therein mentioned, as relates to the assessment of the boundary-fence or wall of the garden belonging to Buckingham House.
- II. An Act to revive and continue expired commissions, appointments, patents, and grants in Ireland; and to indemnify certain persons in relation thereto.
- III. An Act to indemnify persons who have acted as deputy lieutenants in Scotland without due qualification.
- IV. An Act to abolish certain oaths and affirmations taken and made in the customs and excise departments of his majesty's revenue, and to substitute declarations in lieu thereof.
- V. An Act to enable his majesty to make leases, copies, and grants of offices, lands, and hereditaments, parcel of the duchy of Cornwall, or annexed to the same.
- VI. An Act for continuing, until the 30th day of June, 1832, the several acts for regulating the turnpike roads in Great Britain which will expire at the end of the present session of Parliament.
- VII. An Act to continue compositions for assessed taxes until the fifth day of April, 1833, and to grant relief in certain cases.
- VIII. An Act to suspend, until the end of the next session of parliament, the making of lists, and the ballots and enrolments, for the militia of the united kingdom.
- IX. An Act to repeal so much of certain acts as requires certain oaths to be taken by members of the House of Commons before the lord steward or his deputies.
- X. An Act to reduce the salary of the master and worker of his majesty's mint.
- XI. An Act for enabling his majesty to make provision for supporting the royal dignity of the queen in case she shall survive his majesty.
- XII. An Act for ascertaining the boundaries of the forest of Dean, and for inquiring into the rights and privileges claimed by free miners of the Hundred of Saint Briavel's, and for other purposes.
- XIII. An Act to repeal an act of the 19 Geo. III. for repealing so much of several acts as prohibit the growth and produce of tobacco in Ireland, and to permit the importation of tobacco of the growth and produce of that kingdom into Great Britain.
- XIV. An Act for raising the sum of 13,616,400*l.* by exchequer bills, for the service of the year 1831.
- XV. An Act to defray the charge of the pay, clothing, and contingent and other expenses of the disembodied militia in Great Britain and Ireland, and to grant allowances in certain cases to subaltern officers, adjutants, paymasters, quartermasters, surgeons, assistant-surgeons, surgeons' mates, and serjeant-majors, of the militia, until the 30th day of June, 1832.
- XVI. An Act to discontinue or alter the duties of customs upon coals, slates, cotton, wool, barilla, and wax.
- XVII. An Act to provide for the better order and government of Ireland, by lieutenants for the several counties, counties of cities, and counties of towns therein.
- XVIII. An Act for transferring the duties of receivers-general of the land and assessed taxes to persons executing the offices of inspectors of taxes, and for making other provisions for the receipt and remittance of the said taxes.



- XIX. An Act to repeal the duties of Excise and draw-backs on candles.
- XX. An Act to enable his Majesty to grant an annual sum to her royal highness Victoria Maria Louisa duchess of Kent, for a more adequate provision for her said royal highness, and for the honourable support and education of her royal highness the princess Alexandrina Victoria of Kent.
- XXI. An Act to explain and amend two acts of the 34 and 38 Geo. III. so far as the same relate to double assessments of the land tax.
- XXII. An Act to amend the laws relating to hackney carriages, and to waggon, carts, and drays, used in the metropolis; and to place the collection of the duties on hackney carriages and on hawkers and pedlars in England under the commissioners of stamps.
- XXIII. An Act to amend an act of the 14 Geo. III. for establishing a fund towards defraying the charges of the administration of justice, and support of the civil government within the province of Quebec in America.
- XXIV. An Act to amend several acts passed for authorising the issue of Exchequer bills, and the advance of money for carrying on public works and fisheries, and employment of the poor; and to authorize a further issue of Exchequer bills for the purposes of the said acts.
- XXV. An Act to amend the acts for regulating turnpike roads in England, so far as they relate to certain exemptions from toll.
- XXVI. An Act to amend an Act of the fifty-second year of the reign of his majesty king George the Third, respecting the audit of the public accounts of Ireland; and to appoint the number of commissioners competent to grant quietus to public accountants, under an Act passed in the fifty-sixth year of the reign of his majesty king George the Third, for consolidating the public revenues of Great Britain and Ireland.
- XXVII. An Act to enable the treasurer of the county of Clare to issue his warrants for the levying of the presentments made at the Spring assizes of the year 1831.
- XXVIII. An Act to apply the surplus ways and means and a sum out of the consolidated fund to the service of the year 1831.
- XXIX. An Act to authorize and empower the commissioners appointed by an Act of the seventh year of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for extending to Charing Cross, the Strand, and places adjacent, the powers of an Act for making a more convenient communication from Mary-le-bonne Park, to make and form a new street from the Strand to Charles-street Covent Garden, and to widen the north end of Bow-street into Long Acre; and for other purposes.
- XXX. An Act to equalize the duties on wine.
- XXXI. An Act to improve the administration of justice in Ireland.
- XXXII. An Act to amend the laws in England relative to game.
- XXXIII. An Act for the extension and promotion of public works in Ireland.
- XXXIV. An Act for appointing commissioners to continue the inquiries concerning charities in England and Wales for two years, and from thence to the end of the then next session of Parliament.
- XXXV. An Act to explain and amend an Act for regulating the receipt and future appropriation of fees and emoluments receivable by officers of the superior courts of common law.
- XXXVI. An Act to repeal several Acts and parts of Acts prohibiting the payment of wages in goods, or otherwise than in the current coin of the realm.
- XXXVII. An Act to prohibit the payment, in certain trades, of wages in goods, otherwise than in the current coin of the realm.
- XXXVIII. An Act to amend and render more effectual an Act passed in the seventh and eighth years of the reign of his late majesty, intituled An Act to amend the Acts for building and promoting the building of additional churches in populous parishes.
- XXXIX. An Act to repeal the laws relating to apprentices and other young persons employed in cotton factories and in cotton mills, and to make further provisions in lieu thereof.
- XL. An Act to repeal so much of an Act for the management of the customs as allows certain fees to be taken by officers of the customs; and to make further regulations in respect thereof.
- XLI. An Act for amending the laws relative to the appointment of special constables, and for the better preservation of the peace.
- XLII. An Act to amend an Act of the



fifty-ninth year of his majesty king George the Third, for the relief and employment of the poor.

XLIII. An Act for amending and making more effectual the laws concerning turnpike roads in Scotland.

XLIV. An Act to amend an Act passed in the parliament of Ireland, in the fifteenth and sixteenth years of the reign of his majesty king George the Third, intituled An Act to prevent and punish tumultuous risings of persons within this kingdom, and for other purposes therein mentioned.

XLV. An Act to extend the provisions of an Act passed in the twenty-ninth year of the reign of his majesty king Charles the Second, intituled An Act for confirming and perpetuating augmentations made by ecclesiastical persons to small vicarages and curacies; and for other purposes.

XLVI. An Act to allow the importation of lumber, and of fish and provisions, duty-free, into the islands of Barbadoes and Saint Vincent; and to indemnify the governors and others for having permitted the importation of those articles duty-free.

XLVII. An Act to revive, for one year, three Acts made in the forty-seventh and fiftieth years of the reign of his majesty king George the Third, and in the tenth year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for preventing improper persons from having arms in Ireland, and to indemnify such persons as may have acted in the execution of and pursuant to the provisions of the said Acts since the expiration thereof.

XLVIII. An Act to amend an Act passed in the parliament of Ireland in the fifth year of his majesty king George the Third, for establishing public hospitals in Ireland.

XLIX. An Act to repeal so much of an Act passed in Ireland, in the fourth year of king George the First, for the better regulating the town of Galway, and for strengthening the Protestant interest therein, as limits the franchise created by the said Act to Protestants only.

L. An Act to enable the commissioners of his Majesty's treasury to make a conveyance of Fresh Wharf in the city of London.

LI. An Act to amend an Act of the seventh year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for

making provision for the uniform valuation of lands and tenements in the several baronies, parishes, and other divisions of counties in Ireland, for the purpose of the more equally levying of the rates and charges upon the same.

LII. An Act to repeal an Act passed in the fifty-second year of the reign of his majesty king George the Third, to provide for the more speedy examination, controlling and finally auditing the military accounts of Ireland.

LIII. An Act to regulate the payment of the duties on hops.

LIV. An Act to apply the sum of 1,800,000*l.* out of the Consolidated Fund to the service of the year 1831, and to appropriate the supplies granted in this session of Parliament.

LV. An Act to consolidate and amend the laws for suppressing the illicit making of malt and distillation of spirits in Ireland.

LVI. An Act to establish a court in bankruptcy.

LVII. An Act to empower landed proprietors in Ireland to sink, embank, and remove obstructions in rivers.

LVIII. An Act to enable courts of law to give relief against adverse claims made upon persons having no interest in the subject of such claims.

LIX. An Act to enable churchwardens and overseers to inclose land belonging to the crown for the benefit of poor persons residing in the parish in which such crown land is situated.

LX. An Act for the better regulation of vestries, and for the appointment of auditors of accounts, in certain parishes of England and Wales.

## PUBLIC ACTS,

*Of a Local and Personal Nature,  
to be noticed by the Courts.*

i. An Act for erecting and maintaining a pier and other works for the more conveniently landing and embarking passengers in the port of the town of Southampton.

ii. An Act for erecting and maintaining a bridge over the river Lagan, at Belfast; and for making suitable approaches thereto.

iii. An Act for the establishment of a chapel of ease, to be called Grosvenor Chapel, in the parish of Saint George



- Hanover-square in the county of Middlesex, and for providing for the maintenance of the said chapel, and a stipend for the minister thereof.
- iv. An Act for settling disputed rights respecting tithes within the parish of Ashton-under-Line in the county palatine of Lancaster, and for fixing certain annual payments in lieu thereof.
  - v. An Act for the better raising and securing the fund established for making provision for the widows of the writers to his majesty's signet in Scotland.
  - vi. An Act to amend an Act for vesting and securing to John Stephen Langton, esq. certain profits and emoluments for a limited time.
  - vii. An Act to enable the Yorkshire Fire and Life Insurance Company to sue and be sued in the name of their secretary, or of any one of the directors of the said company.
  - viii. An Act to amend certain Acts passed in the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for opening a street from the Cross of Glasgow to Monteith Row.
  - ix. An Act to alter and amend an Act passed in the sixth year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for regulating the conversion of the statute labour within the barony of Gorbals in the city of Glasgow and county of Lanark.
  - x. An Act to amend and extend the powers of an act for recovering, draining, and preserving certain lands; and for better supplying with water the mills, manufactories, and other works situated on the river Leven, in the counties of Kinross and Fife.
  - xi. An Act to amend and enlarge the several Acts relating to the Bolton and Leigh Railway.
  - xii. An Act to alter the line of the Avon and Gloucester Railway, to make certain branches from the same, and to amend the Act for making the said railway.
  - xiii. An Act for making a turnpike road (with a branch therefrom) from the Angel Inn, near Darlington in the county of Durham, to Barton-lane-end, in the county of York.
  - xiv. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Norwich to Cromer in the county of Norfolk, and two branches of road leading towards Holt, and towards Wolterton in the said county.
  - xv. An Act for repairing and improving the road from Doncaster, through Ferrybridge to the south side of Tadcaster Cross, in the west riding of the county of York.
  - xvi. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving several roads leading into and from the town of Cheltenham in the county of Gloucester, and for making new branches of roads to communicate therewith.
  - xvii. An Act for making and maintaining a road from Thornset in the county of Derby to Furnace colliery within Disley in the county of Chester, and two several branches therefrom.
  - xviii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving several roads therein mentioned, leading to, through, and from the town of Monmouth, and for making several new lines and diversions of road to communicate therewith, in the counties of Monmouth, Gloucester, and Hereford.
  - xix. An Act for repairing the road from the bridge on the old river at Barton to Brandon Bridge in the county of Suffolk.
  - xx. An Act for more effectually repairing and otherwise improving the several roads from the South Gate in the borough of King's Lynn, into the parishes of East Walton, Narborough, Stoke Ferry, and Downham Market, in the county of Norfolk.
  - xxi. An Act for more effectually repairing the roads from the borough of King's Lynn, and other roads therein mentioned, and for making a new line of road at Castle Rising, all in the county of Norfolk.
  - xxii. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road between the city of Durham and the village of Shotley Bridge in the county of Durham.
  - xxiii. An Act for consolidating the trusts of certain roads called the Breamish and Wooler turnpike roads, in the county of Northumberland, and for more effectually improving and maintaining the same.
  - xxiv. An Act for more effectually maintaining and improving the road from Soho Hill in the parish of Handsworth to the Walsall road on the northern side of Hamstead Bridge, and another road from Brown's Green to the Friary, in the county of Stafford.
  - xxv. An Act for repairing and improving certain roads in the counties of



Stafford and Salop, leading to and from the town of Wolverhampton in the county of Stafford.

xxvi. An Act for more effectually repairing certain roads leading to and from the town of Abergavenny in the county of Monmouth, and for making and maintaining several new branches of road to communicate therewith.

xxvii. An Act for making and maintaining a road from the bottom of Kirkgate to the bottom of Westgate, both in the parish of Wakefield in the west riding of the county of York.

xxviii. An Act to amend an Act of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for more effectually maintaining the road from Teignmouth to Dawlish, and for making roads from Dawlish to the Exeter turnpike roads, together with a road from Southtown to Chudleigh, and certain branches communicating with the same, all in the county of Devon; and to make and maintain other roads communicating with the said roads.

xxix. An Act for more effectually repairing, amending, and improving the roads from Liverpool to Prescott, Ashton, and Warrington, in the county palatine of Lancaster.

xxx. An Act to continue and amend an Act of the fifth year of his late majesty, for repairing the roads from Durweston Bridge to Caundle Bishop, and other roads, in the counties of Dorset and Somerset, so far as relates to the Vale of Blackmoor turnpike roads.

xxxi. An Act for making and maintaining a turnpike road from the south end of Mitford Bridge, in the parish of Tedburn Saint Mary, to Chudleigh Bridge, and from Crockham Bridge to the Exeter turnpike road in Chudleigh, all in the county of Devon.

xxxii. An Act for amending certain roads in the county of Somerset, and for placing them, and other roads, under the care and management of the trustees of the Langport, Somerton, and Castle Cary roads.

xxxiii. An Act to enable the justices of the peace for the three divisions of the county of Lincoln to purchase the site of Lincoln Castle; and to empower the Court of Gaol Sessions for the said county to maintain and support the judge's house, county hall, and courts of assize; and for other purposes affecting the county at large.

xxxiv. An Act for improving, repairing,

and maintaining the harbours of the burgh of Rothesay in the county of Bute, and for building and maintaining a gaol, court-house, and offices for the said burgh and county.

xxxv. An Act for making and maintaining a railway from Rutherglen Green to Wellshott in the county of Lanark.

xxxvi. An Act for draining and improving certain low lands situate within the several townships of Norton, Campsall, Asken, Moss, Fenwick, Little Smeaton, Stubbs Walden, Womersley, Whitley, Baln, Pollington, Snaith and Cowick, and Sykehouse, in the several parishes of Campsall, Womersley, Kellington, Snaith, and Fishlake, all in the west riding of the county of York.

xxxvii. An Act for maintaining the road from Wakefield to Austerlands in the west riding of the county of York.

xxxviii. An Act for making and repairing certain roads leading across the county of Stirling, and other roads in the said county.

xxxix. An Act to amend an Act for more effectually repairing and improving the road from Wendover to the town of Buckingham in the county of Buckingham.

xl. An Act for improving and maintaining the road from the south side of a bridge over the river Colne, called Engine Bridge, in the township of Huddersfield in the west riding of the county of York, to Woodhead in the county palatine of Chester, and from thence to a bridge over the river Mersey, called Enterclough Bridge, on the confines of the county of Derby.

xli. An Act for more effectually repairing and improving certain roads leading to and from the town of Cirencester in the county of Gloucester, and Wootton Bassett in the county of Wilts.

lxii. An Act to continue and amend an Act for more effectually repairing several roads in and through his majesty's forest of Dean in the county of Gloucester; and to convert certain highways in the parishes of Staunton and Newland in the said county into turnpike roads.

lxiii. An Act for repairing the road from the town of Wisbech in the Isle of Ely in the county of Cambridge to the town of Thorney, in the same isle and county.



- xliv. An Act for improving and maintaining the road from Ludlow in the county of Salop, through Woofferton and Little Hereford, to Monk's Bridge in the said county, and also from Ludlow to Orleton in the county of Hereford.
- xlv. An Act to alter and amend an Act passed in the seventh and eighth year of the reign of his late majesty, intituled An Act for carrying into effect certain improvements within the city of Edinburgh, and adjacent to the same.
- xlvi. An Act for extending the royalty of the burgh of Dundee, and for amending the sett or municipal constitution of the said burgh.
- xlvii. An Act for repealing, altering, enlarging, and amending certain provisions of an act passed in the fifty-sixth year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Third, intituled An Act for the incorporation of the Highland Society of London, for the better management of the funds of the society, and for rendering its exertions more extensive and beneficial to the public.
- xlviii. An Act for erecting a county hall and courts of justice, and also for providing accommodation for his majesty's justices of assize, in and for the county of Worcester.
- xlix. An Act for endowing a church called Saint Bridgett, in the parish of Liverpool in the county palatine of Lancaster.
- i. An Act for extinguishing tithes, and customary payments in lieu of tithes, within the parish of Llanelly in the county of Carmarthen, and for making compensation in lieu thereof.
- ii. An Act for the better management of the poor in the several parishes and hamlets in the city of Norwich and county of the same city.
- lii. An Act to consolidate and amend the several Acts for making the West India Docks.
- liii. An Act for granting certain powers to a company called the General Steam Navigation Company.
- liv. An Act to amend and enlarge the powers of an Act passed in the eleventh year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, intituled An Act for making and maintaining a navigable cut or canal from Lough Corrib to the bay of Galway, and for the improvement of the harbour of Galway.
- lv. An Act for the further improvement of the port and harbour of Belfast in Ireland, and for other purposes.
- lvi. An Act to amend the several acts for making and maintaining the Ulster canal in the counties of Fermanagh and Armagh.
- lvii. An Act for inclosing, draining, and warping lands within the townships or hamlets of Frodingham, Scunthorpe, and Gunhouse (otherwise Gunnas), all in the parish of Frodingham in the county of Lincoln.
- lviii. An Act for amending an Act passed in the eleventh year of the reign of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for making and maintaining a railway from the lands of Polloc and Govan to the river Clyde ; and to alter and extend the powers of the company of proprietors of the said railway.
- lix. An Act for making a railway from Manchester in the county palatine of Lancaster to Sheffield in the west riding of the county of York.
- lx. An Act to enable the company of proprietors of the canal navigation from Manchester to Bolton and to Bury to make and maintain a railway from Manchester to Bolton and to Bury in the county palatine of Lancaster, upon or near the line of the said canal navigation, and to make and maintain a collateral branch to communicate therewith.
- lxi. An Act for more effectually making, amending, widening, repairing, and keeping in repair certain roads in the county of Forfar.
- lxii. An Act to amend an Act of his late majesty king George the Fourth, for repairing the several roads leading to and from the city of Exeter, and for making certain new lines of road to communicate with the same, and for keeping in repair Exe Bridge and Countess Wear Bridge ; and to make and maintain other roads communicating with the said roads.
- lxiii. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from Aylesbury in the county of Buckingham to Hockliffe in the county of Bedford.
- lxiv. An Act for the more effectually repairing and otherwise improving the road from Sunderland near the sea, in the county of Durham, to the city of Durham.
- lxv. An Act for repairing and improving the several roads within the Kid-



- welly district of roads in the county of Carmarthen, and for making new lines of road within the said district, and building a bridge across the river Lloughor at Spitty Bank, and a bridge or embankment across the river Gwendraith Fawr at the ford.
- lxvi. An Act for better repairing and improving several roads leading to and from the town of Frome in the county of Somerset.
- lxvii. An Act for better regulating the poor within the parish of Birmingham in the county of Warwick; and for empowering the guardians of the poor to grant building leases of certain lands vested in them, or otherwise to sell and dispose of the same, and to apply the monies to arise therefrom in the enlargement or rebuilding of the present workhouse; and for other purposes.
- lxviii. An Act to alter and amend the several Acts for making navigable the river Kennet in the county of Berks.
- lxix. An Act for making and maintaining a railroad from Westland Row in the city of Dublin to the head of the western pier of the royal harbour of Kingstown in the county of Dublin, with branches to communicate therewith.
- lxx. An Act for repairing and improving the mail coach road through the county of Tyrone.
- lxxi. An Act for more effectually making and repairing certain roads in the counties of Fife, Kinross, Perth, and Clackmanan.
- lxxii. An Act for more effectually repairing the road from North Shields in the county of Northumberland to the town of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, and certain branches communicating therewith; and also for making and repairing additional branches of road.
- lxxiii. An Act to alter, amend, and enlarge the powers of the several Acts now in force relating to the new river or cut from the Eau Brink to King's Lynn in the county of Norfolk, called the Eau Brink cut; and to raise further funds for carrying the said acts into execution.
- lxxiv. An Act for more effectually improving the road from the Pondyards in the county of Hertford to the town of Chipping Barnet in the same county.
- lxxv. An Act to repeal in part an Act passed in the parliament of Ireland in the thirty-second year of the reign of king George the Third, relating to a portion of the lands of Ballinaspeg, near the city of Cork, belonging to the see of Cork, and to enable the bishops of that see to demise the same, under certain restrictions.
- lxxvi. An Act for regulating the vend and delivery of coals in the cities of London and Westminster, and in certain parts of the counties of Middlesex, Surrey, Kent, Essex, Hertfordshire, Buckinghamshire, and Berkshire.



## PRICES OF STOCKS in each Month in 1831,

*Highest and Lowest.*

	Bank Stock.	3 per Ct. Reduced	3 per Ct. Consols.	3½ per Cts. 1818	3½ per Cts. red.	New 4 per Cts.	4 per Cts. 1826.	Long Annuity.	India Stock.	India Bonds.	South S. Stock.	Ex. Bills. £. 1000.
January .. {	204 196½	82½ 81½	81½ 80½	91 90¼	90½ 90½	90½ 89½	99½ 98½	17½ 17½	218 215½	18 p. 8 p.	91 90½	36 p. 17 p.
February.. {	203 199	81½ 79	81 79½	90½ 88½	90½ 87½	89½ 87½	99 97½	17½ 16½	212 204½	16 p. 2 p.	90½ 90	35 p. 17 p.
March .... {	199 198½	79 76½	79½ 75	86½ 85½	87½ 85½	88½ 83½	96½ 95½	16½ 16½	205 202	7 p. 1 p.	85½ 84½	29 p. 14 p.
April .... {	203 196½	79½ 76½	80½ 78½	88½ 87½	88 86½	89½ 86½	96½ 94½	16½ 16½	207 206	5 p. par.	89½ 87½	26 p. 5 p.
May ..... {	201 196½	82½ 77½	83½ 78½	90½ 86½	91½ 86½	92½ 87½	99½ 94½	17½ 16½	207 203	1 p. 2 d.	92½ 91½	10 p. 4 p.
June..... {	200½ 198½	83½ 81	84½ 83½	91½ 89½	91½ 89½	93 92½	99½ 98½	17½ 16½	203½ 203	5 p. 1 d.	82 81½	18 p. 7 p.
July ..... {	201 199½	84 81½	83½ 81½	92 89½	92 89½	91½ 88½	100½ 98½	17½ 16½	202 200	5 p. 2 d.	80½ 80	16 p. 5 p.
August..... {	200½ 198½	83½ 80½	83½ 80½	91½ 89	91½ 88½	91½ 88½	100½ 97½	17½ 16½	201 198	3 p. 1 d.	80½ 80	16 p. 7 p.
September.. {	199½ 199	82½ 82½	82½ 81½	90½ 89½	90½ 89½	90½ 89½	100½ 99½	17½ 17½	200½ 197½	3 p. 2 d.	81½	13 p. 8 p.
October .. {	192 190	81½ 79	82½ 79½	89½ 86½	89½ 86½	90½ 87½	98½ 96	16½ 16½	198 196	par. 2 d.		11 p. 5 p.
November.. {	192½ 189	82½ 80½	83½ 81½	90½ 88½	89½ 87½	91½ 89½	99½ 98½	16½ 16½	200½ 195	1 d. 3 d.	80½ 79½	8 p. 4 p.
December.. {	193 190½	83½ 81½	83½ 83	90½ 89½	90½ 89	91 90½	99½ 98½	16½ 16½	200 199½	1 d. 4 d.	80½ 80½	8 p. 2 p.



### AVERAGE PRICES OF BRITISH CORN. FROM THE RETURNS.

	Wheat.		Barley.		Oats.		Rye.		Beans.		Peas.	
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
January 25 .....	80	0	48	0	30	0	35	0	45	0	39	0
February 22 ...	78	0	46	0	30	0	34	0	42	0	48	0
March 22.....	72	0	47	0	28	0	40	0	40	0	44	0
April 26.....	76	0	46	0	31	0	34	0	42	0	48	0
May 24 .....	72	0	46	0	30	0	34	0	42	0	48	0
June 21 .....	74	0	46	0	30	0	34	0	42	0	48	0
July 26.....	72	0	42	0	29	0	34	0	42	0	44	0
August 23 .....	78	0	42	0	29	0	34	0	42	0	44	0
September 27...	70	0	42	0	28	0	34	0	42	0	46	0
October 25 .....	59	2	37	6	22	5	55	3	40	7	44	10
November 22 ...	60	10	38	3	22	10	37	3	40	8	44	6
December 27 ...	61	10	38	11	23	1	38	0	43	0	44	6

### AVERAGE PRICES OF HAY & LOAD.

January.	February.	March.	April.	May.	June.
2 10 0	2 10 0	2 10 0	2 17 6	2 10 0	2 12 0
to	to	to	to	to	to
4 0 0	4 0 0	4 0 0	4 8 0	3 15 0	4 0 0
July.	August.	September.	October.	November.	December.
3 10 0	2 15 0	2 15 0	3 0 0	2 10 0	3 5 0
to	to	to	to	to	to
4 4 0	4 0 0	4 0 0	4 0 0	4 0 0	3 15 0

### AVERAGE PRICES OF BUTCHER'S MEAT,

Average Prices per Stone of 8lb. in Smithfield Market, in 1831.

	Beef.				Mutton.				Veal.				Pork.				Lamb.			
	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
Jan ...	3	2	to 4	8	3	0	to 4	10	6	0	to 6	4	4	2	to 5	2	0	0	to 0	0
Feb....	3	0	to 5	0	3	0	to 5	0	5	0	to 6	4	3	2	to 5	4	0	0	to 0	0
March	4	0	to 4	6	4	8	to 5	2	5	0	to 6	0	4	4	to 5	2	0	0	to 0	0
April	3	10	to 4	4	4	4	to 5	0	5	0	to 6	0	4	0	to 5	0	0	0	to 0	0
May...	2	4	to 3	8	2	6	to 4	0	3	8	to 5	0	3	4	to 4	10	0	0	to 0	0
June...	3	10	to 4	6	4	6	to 4	6	4	0	to 5	0	4	0	to 4	10	4	8	to 5	6
July...	2	4	to 3	8	2	4	to 3	10	3	2	to 4	8	3	2	to 4	6	3	10	to 4	2
Aug...	3	6	to 4	2	4	0	to 4	8	4	4	to 5	4	4	0	to 4	10	5	0	to 6	0
Sept...	3	0	to 4	0	3	6	to 4	4	4	0	to 5	0	4	0	to 5	0	4	0	to 5	0
Oct....	3	6	to 4	2	4	2	to 4	10	4	0	to 5	0	4	4	to 5	4	0	0	to 0	0
Nov...	3	4	to 4	2	4	4	to 5	0	4	0	to 4	10	4	0	to 5	4	0	0	to 0	0
Dec...	3	4	to 4	6	3	6	to 4	8	3	4	to 5	4	4	4	to 5	4	0	0	to 0	0



**BILLS OF MORTALITY, from December 15, 1830, to  
December 15, 1831.**

Christened { Males.. 14,217 } 28,263 || Buried { Males.. 12,769 } 25,337  
                   { Females 14,046 }

**WHEREOF HAVE DIED,**

Under two years of age .....	7812	Seventy and eighty .....	1786
Between two and five .....	2647	Eighty and ninety .....	825
Five and ten .....	1031	Ninety and a hundred .....	101
Ten and twenty .....	934	One hundred and one .....	1
Twenty and thirty .....	1649	One hundred and two .....	1
Thirty and forty .....	1968	One hundred and three .....	0
Forty and fifty .....	2175	One hundred and five .....	1
Fifty and sixty .....	2169	One hundred and seven .....	0
Sixty and seventy .....	2237		

**TABLE of the Number of BANKRUPTS & DECLARATIONS of INSOLVENCY.**

	Bankrupts.	Declarations of Insolvency.
January .....	101	10
February .....	81	12
March .....	110	15
April .....	126	18
May .....	145	22
June .....	112	13
July .....	103	14
August .....	94	14
September .....	104	22
October .....	92	13
November .....	204	23
December .....	161	12
	1433	188

**METEOROLOGICAL TABLE for 1831.**

Month.	Barometer.		Thermometer.		Pluvia- meter.	Winds.							
	Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest		Inches.	N.	N. E.	E.	S. E.	S.	S. W.	W.
January	30·640	29·075	53	25	2·300	4	5½	8	5½	2½	1	½	4
February	30·431	29·134	60	31	2·400	1½	1	0	3½	3	7	4	8
March ..	30·443	29·213	58	32	1·770	1½	4½	3½	2	4½	5	6½	3½
April ..	30·420	29·195	68	32	2·525	2	6½	2	4	6	3	3	3½
May....	30·303	29·478	72	35	2·070	3½	8	4	8½	½	4½	1	1
June ...	30·241	29·681	74	48	1·555	4	1	0	2	½	9	8½	5
July....	30·348	29·606	79	52	3·465	2	4	1¼	6	1¼	6	8	2½
August..	30·296	29·655	77	52	1·815	3½	2	3	2½	1	5½	7½	6
Septem.	30·302	29·295	71	45	3·711	3	½	1½	5	3½	8	2	6½
October.	30·428	29·231	68	40	4·835	½	½	2	1	7	12	7½	½
Novem.	30·576	29·449	58	30	2·610	1	2½	1	0	½	7	9	9
Decem.	30·458	29·012	58	28	3·880	2	3½	1	½	4	12½	2½	5
	30·640	29·012	79	25	32·936	28½	39½	27¼	40½	34¼	80½	60	54½



A TABLE, showing the Number of Houses rated for the Inhabited House Tax, the Amount of the Rental of each, and the Number of the Farm-Houses exempted from such Tax in each County of England and Wales, for the Year ending January, 1831.

PLACES.	No. of Houses.	Amount of Rental.	No. of Farm-Houses exempt.
<i>England.</i>		£.	
Bedford.....	723	12,619	601
Berks .....	3,713	83,572	389
Bucks .....	1,894	35,655	925
Cambridge .....	2,615	49,781	2,118
Chester .....	4,784	92,854	7,599
Cornwall .....	2,852	48,117	6,982
Cumberland .....	2,400	42,040	7,159
Derby .....	2,287	45,633	3,249
Devon .....	12,397	237,000	7,471
Dorset .....	3,051	57,868	1,948
Durham .....	4,269	69,471	4,230
Essex.....	6,264	139,806	2,597
Gloucester .....	9,080	251,974	2,160
Hereford .....	1,714	31,424	2,331
Hertford .....	3,490	70,299	948
Huntingdon .....	945	16,791	930
Kent .....	16,129	347,110	3,065
Lancaster .....	28,405	795,832	6,706
Leicester .....	3,357	62,748	2,447
Lincoln.....	4,026	78,694	5,265
London, Middlesex, and Westminster....	116,279	5,143,340	495
Monmouth .....	1,688	31,572	1,490
Norfolk.....	5,333	97,067	4,668
Northampton .....	2,237	40,327	3,398
Northumberland .....	6,140	120,424	4,963
Nottingham .....	3,597	71,396	1,217
Oxford .....	3,628	61,869	983
Rutland.....	241	4,621	313
Salop.....	3,402	63,091	2,343
Somerset .....	16,568	512,969	6,936
Southampton .....	9,362	198,321	2,093
Stafford.....	6,122	108,507	3,037
Suffolk .....	3,573	61,909	3,729
Surrey .....	33,865	964,438	939
Sussex .....	6,818	202,837	1,673
Warwick .....	9,368	190,602	3,432
Westmoreland .....	1,039	21,120	3,973
Wilts .....	3,622	68,577	1,245
Worcester .....	4,872	100,826	2,252
York .....	20,189	415,539	11,075
<i>Wales.</i>			
Anglesey .....	220	4,080	....
Brecon .....	460	7,599	683
Cardigan .....	74	999	134
Carmarthen .....	570	31,268	1,311
Carnarvon.....	538	7,982	....
Denbigh .....	856	14,411	4,258
Flint .....	176	3,375	830
Glamorgan .....	1,712	12,701	727
Merioneth.....	292	4,578	877
Montgomery.....	605	7,971	....
Pembroke.....	740	12,700	727
Radnor .....	174	2,202	....



## A SIMILAR TABLE FOR THE METROPOLIS.

PLACES.	No. of Houses.	Amount of Rental.	No. of Farm-Houses exempt.
City of London .....	13,600	£. 771,614	....
— of Westminster .....	17,681	1,200,977	....
Holborn Division .....	15,711	643,073	....
Parishes of St. Giles and St. George, Bloomsbury .....	4,272	245,983	....
Finsbury Division .....	16,084	505,160	16
Tower ditto .....	26,282	611,676	....
Kensington ditto .....	3,907	171,550	....
St. Mary-le-bone .....	10,421	731,752	....
Inns of Court .....	1,710	74,739	....
Southwark .....	4,658	127,630	....
Three Divisions of East Brixton .....	22,537	633,609	6
Blackheath .....	5,623	139,282	49
Becontree Division, including Havering, Essex .....	1,765	59,061	130

## INHABITED HOUSE TAX.

Rated at	No. of Houses.	Rental.
£10 and under £15 .....	116,030	£. 1,316,738
15 ——— 20 .....	66,394	1,095,127
20 ——— 30 .....	74,499	1,679,082
30 ——— 40 .....	44,909	1,455,113
40 ——— 50 .....	26,027	1,087,064
50 ——— 60 .....	14,723	753,346
60 ——— 70 .....	10,264	628,804
70 ——— 80 .....	5,640	402,789
80 ——— 90 .....	4,817	390,076
90 ——— 100 .....	1,891	172,464
100 ——— 110 .....	4,093	412,788
110 ——— 150 .....	4,091	505,293
150 ——— 200 .....	2,494	405,991
200 ——— 300 .....	1,925	426,667
300 ——— 400 .....	551	179,684
400 and upwards .....	438	243,083
Total No. of Houses taxed for the House Duty .....	378,786	11,154,109

Number of Farm-Houses exempt, 136,194.

Amount of the Tax on Inhabited Houses in 1830, £1,361,825.

## CRIMINAL LAW.

Number of Persons Committed, Convicted, Sentenced, or Acquitted of Crimes, during the Seven Years ended December, 1830.

Committed for Trial....	{ Males..... 96,513 }	Total.... 115,569.
	{ Females.... 19,056 }	
Acquitted.....	23,330	Sentenced to Imprisonment, Hard
No Bills found and not prosecuted. ....	12,387	Labour, Whipping, &c. :—
Convicted .....	80,852	
Sentenced :—		For 5 years..... 1
To Death.....	8,781	4 ..... 1
Transportation—For Life ....	1,692	3 ..... 59
For 35 years .....	1	2 and above 1 year .... 1,984
28 .....	4	1 and above 6 months .. 8,662
21 .....	3	6 months and under .... 41,434
14 .....	2,572	Whipped and fined ..... 2,068
10 .....	1	Executed..... 407
9 .....	1	
7 .....	13,587	
4 .....	1	



## STATE OF SAVINGS' BANKS, FRIENDLY AND CHARITABLE SOCIETIES.—IN ENGLAND.

	Total of Depositors.	Friendly Societies.	Charitable Societies.	Increase or decrease in Accounts since 1829.	Total Investment.	Increase or decrease in amount since 1819.	Average of each Depositor.
Bedfordshire ....	1,765	38	22	17 <i>i</i>	£69,661	£ 1,046 <i>i</i>	30 <i>l.</i>
Berkshire .....	7,138	67	49	142 <i>i</i>	260,639	3,106 <i>i</i>	34
Buckinghamshire.	1,857	26	14	8 <i>i</i>	60,911	544 <i>d</i>	30
Cambridgeshire. .	1,678	46	22	30 <i>i</i>	69,799	2,876 <i>i</i>	37
Cheshire .....	7,647	104	2	44 <i>i</i>	321,846	10,941 <i>i</i>	39
Cornwall .....	5,513	93	14	55 <i>i</i>	249,874	605 <i>i</i>	42
Cumberland ....	4,016	22	21	28 <i>i</i>	131,912	2,025 <i>i</i>	32
Derbyshire.....	5,513	123	21	253 <i>d</i>	220,182	7,428 <i>d</i>	37
Devonshire .....	26,564	378	138	701 <i>i</i>	965,643	10,002 <i>d</i>	33
Dorsetshire.....	5,526	58	35	270 <i>i</i>	250,870	1,422 <i>d</i>	42
Durham .....	4,578	54	22	244 <i>d</i>	158,298	14,355 <i>d</i>	33
Essex.....	8,157	163	90	164 <i>i</i>	301,545	2,482 <i>i</i>	34
Gloucester .....	13,660	185	77	91 <i>d</i>	563,524	10,095 <i>d</i>	39
Hampshire.....	7,860	104	53	256 <i>i</i>	318,516	8,249 <i>i</i>	38
Herefordshire ...	3,892	14	15	53 <i>d</i>	130,712	4,014 <i>d</i>	32
Hertfordshire....	3,177	80	90	102 <i>d</i>	166,726	6,740 <i>d</i>	45
Huntingdonshire .	747	30	25	19 <i>i</i>	26,394	26 <i>i</i>	31
Kent .....	16,885	171	100	218 <i>i</i>	556,719	10,815 <i>d</i>	31
Lancashire .....	26,147	374	159	1948 <i>i</i>	965,144	66,141 <i>i</i>	38
Leicestershire....	3,366	58	27	22 <i>d</i>	100,601	1,098 <i>i</i>	28
Lincolnshire. ....	7,017	74	46	51 <i>i</i>	225,630	336 <i>i</i>	30
London (City) ..	19,392	12	3	1151 <i>i</i>	455,408	5,768 <i>i</i>	23
Middlesex .....	47,596	102	100	2966 <i>i</i>	1,398,486	49,448 <i>i</i>	29
Monmouthshire ..	1,232	32	10	14 <i>i</i>	38,870	1,611 <i>d</i>	27
Norfolk.....	6,168	69	18	155 <i>i</i>	198,554	5,484 <i>i</i>	31
Northamptonshire	4,845	44	34	50 <i>i</i>	177,577	2,100 <i>i</i>	34
Northumberland .	6,987	90	19	15 <i>i</i>	307,772	8,966 <i>d</i>	42
Nottinghamshire .	7,725	256	15	275 <i>i</i>	242,752	2,893 <i>d</i>	29
Oxfordshire .....	5,201	46	36	200 <i>i</i>	157,606	129 <i>d</i>	28
Shropshire .....	9,234	111	26	56 <i>i</i>	391,964	5,030 <i>d</i>	38
Somersetshire....	12,141	170	70	460 <i>i</i>	563,414	10,838 <i>d</i>	42
Staffordshire .....	7,387	172	53	105 <i>i</i>	264,173	3,603 <i>i</i>	32
Suffolk .....	5,371	114	37	161 <i>i</i>	190,567	1,513 <i>d</i>	32
Surrey.....	13,389	76	38	432 <i>i</i>	393,511	1,176 <i>i</i>	29
Sussex.....	8,506	51	42	45 <i>i</i>	276,793	3,915 <i>i</i>	31
Warwickshire ...	6,266	59	55	625 <i>i</i>	184,589	12,801 <i>i</i>	28
Westmoreland ...	674	3	0	34 <i>i</i>	24,041	963 <i>i</i>	35
Wiltshire.....	6,612	76	45	158 <i>d</i>	266,076	6,159 <i>d</i>	37
Worcestershire...	6,953	74	45	162 <i>i</i>	265,997	2,630 <i>i</i>	37
Yorkshire.....	30,161	298	99	666 <i>i</i>	1,129,054	1,570 <i>d</i>	35
	367,812	4117	1737	9895 <i>i</i>	13,080,255	81,084	34

The above-mentioned number of Depositors are thus divided :—

Depositors.	No.	Increase or Decrease since 1829.	Average Amount of each.
Under £ 20 each.....	187,770	7,082 <i>i</i>	£ 7
..... 50 .....	102,621	2,502 <i>i</i>	30
..... 100 .....	48,343	208 <i>d</i>	68
..... 150 .....	17,214	269 <i>i</i>	123
..... 200 .....	7,527	488 <i>i</i>	168
Above 200 each.....	4,237	551 <i>d</i>	247
Friendly Societies.....	4,117	111 <i>d</i>	162
Charitable Societies .....	1,787	424 <i>d</i>	71

On the 20th November, 1830, there were in England 379 Savings' Banks 10 of which made no return ; since that time, 5 others have been established.



## UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

## EXAMINATIONS. TERM—PASCHAL, 1831.

*In Literis Humanioribus.*

## CLASSIS I.

Thos. D. Acland, *Christ Church*.  
 Robert Browne, *St. John's*.  
 Henry Churton, *Balliol*.  
 Thos. L. Claughton, *Trinity*.  
 Herbert Kynaston, *Christ Church*.  
 Robert F. Wilson, *Oriel*.  
 Samuel F. Wood, *do*.

## CLASSIS II.

Charles Balston, *Corpus*.  
 Charles Bunyon, *New College*.  
 Arch. Cameron, *Pembroke*.  
 George Casson, *Brasen-nose*.  
 George Clark, *University*.  
 George E. Deacon, *Corpus*.  
 Frederick Holne, *Corpus*.  
 Walter Kitson, *Balliol*.  
 William Pennefather, *do*.  
 Charles Penny, *Pembroke*.  
 Francis Popham, *University*.  
 T. G. Simcox, *Wadham*.  
 Edward Stephens, *Exeter*.  
 Richard E. Tyrwhitt, *Brasen-nose*.  
 William H. Whitworth, *Corpus*.  
 John Williams, *Jesus*.  
 John P. Wilson, *Magdalen*.

## CLASSIS III.

William Boyd, *University*.  
 Daniel Brent, *do*.  
 John S. Broad, *Edmund Hall*.

*In Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis.*

## CLASSIS I.

Thos. D. Acland, *Christ Church*.  
 Charles Balston, *Corpus*.  
 William Boyd, *University*.  
 Robert Browne, *St. John's*.  
 Algernon Perkins, *Oriel*.  
 Thos. G. Simcox, *Wadham*.

## CLASSIS II.

George Kempe, *Exeter*.

TERM—MICHAELMAS, 1831. *In Literis Humanioribus.*

## CLASSIS I.

Folliot Bough, *Exeter*.  
 Charles L. Cornish, *do*.  
 Henry Denison, *Christ Church*.

Francis C. Brooke, *Christ Church*.  
 Frederick Burgmann, *Trinity*.  
 Henry Cary, *Worcester*.  
 Edward W. Foley, *Wadham*.  
 James Gilman, *St. John's*.  
 Charles Green, *Christ Church*.  
 Edmund W. Hughes, *Worcester*.  
 George Kempe, *Exeter*.  
 Henry Moncrieff, *New College*.  
 Francis Moore, *Christ Church*.  
 George N. Simmons, *Trinity*.  
 William Vincent, *Christ Church*.  
 Henry Walker, *do*.

## CLASSIS IV.

John Barrow, *Wadham*.  
 Edward Bigge, *University*.  
 Thos. W. Creaser, *Pembroke*.  
 John R. Errington, *Worcester*.  
 Salisbury Everard, *Balliol*.  
 John Fisher, *Brasen-nose*.  
 Robert Grey, *University*.  
 Edward Hardwicke, *Queen's*.  
 Edward Harland, *Wadham*.  
 Henry Slibson, *Queen's*.  
 Arthur Isham, *Christ Church*.  
 Charles King, *Magdalen*.  
 Forster A. M'Geachy, *Balliol*.  
 John Mytton, *Brasen-nose*.  
 Charles W. Orde, *University*.  
 Hogarth Swale, *Queen's*.  
 George Whidborne, *do*.

## CLASSIS III.

Henry Moncrieff, *New College*.  
 John G. Richards, *Corpus*.

## CLASSIS IV.

Edward Gosling, *Magdalen Hall*.  
 Forster A. M'Geachy, *Balliol*.

## CLASSIS II.

Edward H. Grove, *Balliol*.



John F. Maurice, *Exeter*.  
 Nathaniel J. Meriman, *Brasen-nose*.  
 John B. Morgan, *Trinity*.  
 Isle Grant Overton, *Corpus*.  
 Robert J. Phillimore, *Christ Church*.  
 James Robertson *Pembroke*.  
 John G. Seymer, *St. Alban's Hall*.  
 Gardiner Webster, *Exeter*.  
 Edmund D. Wickham, *Balliol*.

## CLASSIS III.

John H. Allen, *Brasen-nose*.  
 George Arney, *do*.  
 William Borlase, *Queen's*.  
 Arthur Browne, *Christ Church*.  
 John H. Dewhurst, *Worcester*.  
 John S. Dolby, *Lincoln*.  
 Arthur P. Dunlop, *St. John's*.  
 John C. Fisher, *Queen's*.  
 John Floyer, *Balliol*.  
 James Jones, *Jesus*.  
 Edward V. Neale, *Oriel*.

Edward Penny, *St. John's*.  
 Edward O. Trevelyan, *Corpus*.  
 Robert Williams, *Christ Church*.

## CLASSIS IV.

John R. Bloxam, *Magdalen*.  
 William Buckler, *do*.  
 Richard R. Dean, *Christ Church*.  
 Heneage Drummond, *Balliol*.  
 Hon. G. F. Harris, *Christ Church*.  
 Hon. Sidney Herbert, *Oriel*.  
 John F. Lees, *Brasen-nose*.  
 John Mott, *Christ Church*.  
 John R. Nicholl, *Exeter*.  
 Daniel Parsons, *Oriel*.  
 John P. Penson, *Worcester*.  
 Richard V. Pryor, *Balliol*.  
 George H. Scott, *Exeter*.  
 Henry L. Stephens, *Oriel*.  
 Thos. Thistlethwayte, *Christ Church*.  
 Richard P. Warren, *Exeter*.  
 Edward J. Wilcocks, *Lincoln*.

*In Disciplinis Mathematicis et Physicis.*

## CLASSIS I.

Henry Denison, *Christ Church*.  
 William E. Gladstone, *do*.  
 Henry A. Jeffreys, *do*.  
 Charles G. Prideaux, *Balliol*.  
 James Robertson, *Pembroke*.

## CLASSIS II.

Edward V. Neale, *Oriel*.

## CLASSIS III.

Francis J. Ellis, *Merton*.  
 James Mackalt, *Queen's*.  
 James R. Whyte, *Oriel*.

## CHANCELLOR'S PRIZES.

Latin Essay.—“*Quenam fuerit Oratorum Atticorum apud populum Auctoritas*”  
 Charles Wordsworth, *Christ Church*.

English Essay.—“*On the Use and Abuse of Theory*.” Charles P. Eden, *Oriel*



## UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

## EXAMINATIONS. TERM—TRIPOS, 1831.

Moderators. { James Challis, M.A. *Trinity*.  
 { James Bowstead, M.A. *Corpus*.

*Wranglers.*

Ds. Earnshaw	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Gaskin	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Budd	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Worlledge	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Mills, sen.	.....	<i>Pembroke</i> .
Amphlett	.....	<i>Peter</i> .
Peill	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Paget	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Whytehead	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Meller	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Smith	.....	<i>Sidney</i> .
Willan	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Cheadle	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Sheppard	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Rigg	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Bates	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Oliver	.....	<i>Peter</i> .
Mills, jun.	.....	<i>Pembroke</i> .
Paton	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Entwistle	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Blakesley	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Otter	.....	<i>Christ's</i> .
Deges	.....	<i>Jesus</i> .
Winter	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Walker	.....	<i>Christ's</i> .
Bacon	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Hildyard	.....	<i>Clare</i> .
Nash	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Geary	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Harrison	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Hoare	.....	<i>John's</i> .

*Senior Optimes.*

Ds. Delamare	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Dawes	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Colville	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Tyrrell	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Whiston	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Ross-Lewin	.....	<i>Catherine</i> .
Ventris	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Nicholson	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Bonnim	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Mann	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Dixon	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Owston	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .

Stanton	.....	<i>Christ's</i> .
Ballock	.....	<i>Clare</i> .
Swann	.....	<i>Emmanuel</i> .
Dashwood	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Favell	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Hoskin	.....	<i>Pembroke</i> .
Thompson	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Proctor	.....	<i>Christ's</i> .
Stoddart	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Minty	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Klanert	.....	<i>Peter</i> .
Pickwood	.....	<i>Peter</i> .
Harman	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Rogers	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Thomson	.....	<i>Jesus</i> .

*Junior Optimes.*

Ds. Venables	.....	<i>Emmanuel</i> .
Bainbridge	{	<i>Æq.</i> { <i>Catherine</i> .
Cockerton	{	{ <i>John's</i> .
Whittington	.....	<i>Pembroke</i> .
Wallace	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Gaskell	.....	<i>Corpus</i> .
Kennedy	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Fell	.....	<i>Peter</i> .
Sharples	.....	<i>Emmanuel</i> .
Shadwell	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Johnstone	.....	<i>Caius</i> .
Stacye	.....	<i>Christ's</i> .
Fleming	.....	<i>Pembroke</i> .
Steel	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Power	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Blane	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Jerwood	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Spedding	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Vawdry	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Walsh	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Selwyn	.....	<i>John's</i> .
Evans	.....	<i>Queen's</i> .
Foster	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Chatfield	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Morgan	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Fosbrooke	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Yelloly	.....	<i>Trinity</i> .
Fearon	.....	<i>Catherine</i> .

## CLASSICAL TRIPOS, 1831.

Examiners. { John Heath, M.A. *King's*.  
 { Thomas Shelford, B.D. *Corpus*.  
 { Fras. W. Loddington, M.A. *Clare*.  
 { Edward Baines, M.A. *Christ's*.



*First Class.*

Ds. Kennedy ..... *Trinity.*  
 Selwyn ..... *John's.*  
 Blackesley ..... *Trinity.*  
 Johnstone ..... *Caius.*  
 Walsh ..... *Trinity.*  
 Chatfield ..... *Trinity.*  
 Hoare ..... *John's.*

*Second Class.*

Ds. Whiston ..... *Trinity.*  
 Minty ..... *Caius.*  
 Spedding ..... *Trinity.*  
 Wolledge ..... *Trinity.*

Shadwell ..... *John's.*  
 Whytehead ..... *John's.*  
 Sheppard ..... *Trinity.*  
 Venables ..... *Emmanuel.*  
 Dashwood } *Æq. ....* } *Trinity.*  
 Harrison } } *Caius.*

*Third Class.*

Ds. Fell ..... *Peter.*  
 Dawes ..... *Corpus.*  
 Evans ..... *Queen's.*  
 Vawdry ..... *John's.*  
 Swann ..... *Emmanuel.*

CHANCELLOR'S MEDALLISTS, 1831.

J. W. Blakesley ..... *Trinity.*  
 W. H. Hoare ..... *John's.*

CHANCELLOR'S PRIZE.

G. S. Venables ..... *Jesus.*

SIR W. BROWNE'S MEDALS.

Greek Ode }  
 Latin Ode } James Hildyard ..... *Christ's.*  
 Epigrams }

PORSON PRIZE.

George G. Kennedy ..... *John's.*

SEATONIAN PRIZE.

T. E. Hankinson ..... *Corpus.* (With a premium of 100*l.*)



## LAW CASES AND NARRATIVES.

## CONTEMPT OF COURT—PRIVILEGE OF PARLIAMENT.

By a decision of the Court of Chancery, the duchess of Wellington and Mr. Courtenay had been appointed joint guardians of the children of Mr. Long Wellesley. Since that time, the daughter, a child of eleven or twelve years, had remained with her aunts, the Misses Long, by the direction and consent of the guardians. On the 16th of July, sir Edward Sugden stated to the Lord Chancellor that he had a motion to make, founded on a most gross contempt of the orders of that Court. He then read an affidavit by Miss Long, which stated, that the daughter of Mr. Wellesley had been removed, the day before, from the house of the Misses Long by her father; that he was accompanied by four persons who appeared to be constables, and who acted under Mr. Wellesley's directions; that the young lady was taken, by these persons and Mr. Wellesley, away from the Misses Long, although every effort was made by Miss Long's footman to prevent it, and brought in a carriage to town, and that she was now, it was believed, in the house of Mr. Wellesley. Sir Edward Sugden said, he should therefore move for the committal of Mr. Wellesley immediately, for the breach of the former order made in this case, whereby Mr. Wellesley was ordered to be re-

strained from having the custody of his children, or from interfering with those to whom that custody was committed.

The Lord Chancellor said, he would certainly not delay one moment in ordering the child to be restored to the custody of Mr. Courtenay, the guardian. There was a precedent for such prompt interference. The mother of the infant in the case to which he referred was in the Fleet prison, and the latter withdrew from the custody of her guardians, and flew to her mother. Lord Eldon immediately ordered the serjeant-at-arms to go to the prison, bodily to take possession of the child, and to convey her again into the hands of the guardians. In the present case he should act in a similar way. Accordingly he ordered the serjeant-at-arms to set off without delay with his lordship's warrant to Mr. Wellesley's house, or wherever the child might be found, to take her, and bring her into Court, when she should immediately be turned over to Mr. Courtenay. In the meantime his lordship desired the solicitor of Mr. Wellesley to go to him with the affidavit that had just been read, and to return as early as he possibly could, because the Court felt bound to justify its own jurisdiction, which had undoubtedly been grossly violated, and his lordship was determined to dispose of the contempt before he rose, if he should



sit till twelve at night. As regarded the child, the serjeant-at-arms was to consider that he was to have nothing to do with Mr. Wellesley or any body else except the child; he was to find the child, and to take her at once, without asking the permission of either herself, or any other human being.

The serjeant-at-arms returned to the Court at one o'clock, but not accompanied by the child. He informed the Lord Chancellor that when he got to Mr. Wellesley's house, the servant told him that neither Mr. Wellesley, nor any other person, was there. He replied to the servant, that he came for the young lady; that he had the Lord Chancellor's order to take her, and that he must search the house. The servant then observed that he would himself go up stairs, and see if there really was any person there. He soon came back, and said that Mr. Wellesley was up stairs, to whom he should be introduced. On seeing Mr. Wellesley, the serjeant-at-arms repeated the object of his mission, and stated his authority. Mr. Wellesley observed that his daughter was not there, nor would he tell where she was; that he himself would be at the Court in a short time, and see the Lord Chancellor on the subject.

Mr. Wellesley accordingly soon afterwards entered the Court, when the Lord Chancellor asked him, if he had removed his daughter from the custody of the Misses Long; and if he had, what had become of the young lady? Mr. Wellesley admitted that he had removed his daughter from the Misses Long, that he had strong reasons for doing so, and that he had come to the determination that no person but himself should be the

guardian of his children. He knew at the same time the consequences of the step he had taken, and he was ready to submit to them. His Lordship then asked where the young lady was? Mr. Wellesley said, upon his word as a gentleman, he did not know the exact place in which she was, but at the same time he did not wish to conceal from the knowledge of the Court that he had intrusted her to the care of persons for the purpose of placing her beyond the Court's jurisdiction. His Lordship then ordered Mr. Wellesley to be committed for contempt of Court, leaving him, in the mean time, in the custody of the serjeant-at-arms, with instructions that his imprisonment should not be rendered more inconvenient than was necessary for his safe custody.

Mr. Wellesley was member of parliament for the county of Essex. The Lord Chancellor immediately wrote to the Speaker of the House of Commons, informing him that he had committed one of their members for a contempt, "confessed by him in my presence, and in open court. The right of this Court to commit is unquestionable; and it has been enforced against peers of the realm." Mr. Wellesley likewise wrote to the Speaker, complaining of his commitment as a breach of privilege, and requesting the interposition of the House. These letters the Speaker laid before the House; and, as the question had never occurred with a commoner, in its present shape, the matter was referred to a committee of privileges. The committee did not report that there had been any breach of privilege; and on the 26th of July, when the cause came on in the Court of Chancery, the solicitor, Mr. Wel-



lesley's leading counsel, declined to argue the question of want of jurisdiction. His junior, however, Mr. Beames, having prepared himself to argue it, insisted upon arguing it. The Lord Chancellor would not allow him to argue a point which his leader would not take up, but permitted him to state his argument as *amicus curiæ*.

Mr. Beames accordingly proceeded to argue, that the Court had no authority to commit a person enjoying privilege of parliament for such an offence as was imputed to Mr. Wellesley. Under the common law, innumerable cases might be cited from the year books, to shew that peers, knights of the shire, and burgesses, were not liable to arrest, except in three cases, namely, treason, felony, and breach of the peace. This doctrine was also laid down by Lord Coke, in the fourth Institute, page 23, where he shewed that the same rule extended to the Court of Chancery as well as to the courts of common law. This was a branch of the *lex parliamentaria* which was recognized in the case of *Regina v. Page*, reported by Lord Raymond. In the more recent case of *John Wilkes*, it had been held by the Court of Common Pleas, in Lord Hardwicke's time, that the person of a member of parliament could not be taken except for the three sorts of offences mentioned by Lord Coke. In the case of *Freeman v. Aylesbury*, Lord Holt laid it down that the privilege of parliament was the law of the land; and in a case in *Dyer* the principle of the privilege was stated to be, that his attendance was required in parliament for the good of the State. The learned counsel referred to the case of *Hodges v. Moore*, and to

Thorpe's case, in confirmation of his argument, and to the doctrine laid down by Mr. Tidd in his practice that a *capias* could not be sued out against a member of Parliament. He proceeded to show that this common law right was recognized by the statute law, by the act of the 12th and 13th William III, by the 11th George II. c. 24th, and by the 10th George III. c. 50th, which acts had for their object in some cases to curtail the privilege, but still contained provisos in favour of its exercise in all other cases, and the present was not one of the cases in which it was curtailed. He then argued that the doctrine of this Court had always recognized and supported the same operation of the privilege. The early authorities in this Court were not so numerous as those at common law; but he cited lord Chief Gilbert's *Forum Romanum*, where the doctrine was recognized, and in one part of which it was maintained that a peer might abuse the officer who was sent to serve him with process. The learned counsel quoted several cases from the early reporters, to show that attachment would not issue against persons having privilege of Parliament, but that a different remedy was provided against them—that by sequestration. The last point with which he should trouble the Court would be that of the abstract question of contempt: he could find no distinction anywhere taken between civil and criminal contempt. There was, undoubtedly, a difference between aggravated cases of contempt and simple cases; but even in the former class of cases, he contended, the process of the Court was not directed against the offender as a punishment, but a means of enforcing the performance of some



act due to the opposite party, and as a means of ensuring submission to the authority of the Great Seal. The process of the Court, therefore, did not punish as for a criminal act.

The Lord Chancellor gave judgment. He observed that the claims made in respect of privilege were, in earlier times, infinitely more extensive than the good sense and love of freedom that now prevailed could admit. In that very volume of the Reports of Peere Williams, from which Mr. Beames had cited, he would find, in another case, a *dictum* that the first process against a peer or a member of Parliament was a sequestration; and that the servants of such persons were equally entitled to the exemption which their masters enjoyed. The first process against them, also, was sequestration,—sequestration of their liveries and chattels. It was, therefore, little profitable, and less satisfactory, to quote authorities from the older writers, in order to apply them to the present period. To show the power which the law ought to possess, and which power was the protection of the community, and to show how incumbent it was upon the courts to which the administration of that law was committed to guard against the wily, gross, and extravagant pretensions which had been set up in the name and under the colour of privilege, it was not necessary nor expedient to go back to the times of the Plantagenets, the Tudors, or the Charleses. Recent cases might be found even in the times of that illustrious family, under whom the courts of justice, the liberties of the subject, and the privileges of both houses of legislature, had long been so happily enjoyed. Even in the days of

the family now on the throne, who claim only what is theirs by law, and who by no other power than that of the same law protect their people from the injuries of others,—even in these times it had behoved the courts of law to be firm and bold, to see that the limits of their jurisdiction were not encroached upon, not only by individual members, but by the houses of legislature themselves. It might become the duty of the courts to vindicate the law against a portion of those by whom the law was made. It was not under the Edwards or the Harrys, but in the last year of the reign of George II., in 1759, that an action of trespass was tried in the House of Commons, to its own great scandal and disgrace, and to the astonishment of all good men. Admiral Lucas complained to the House that three men had entered upon his fishery, near Plymouth, and instead of indignantly rejecting the complaint, the House ordered the Serjeant-at-arms, to take the defendants into custody. They appeared before the House on their knees, confessed the charge, and, on their promise not to offend in future, they were discharged. Thus, under the pretence of privilege, the plaintiff was the party who tried his own cause, for the House was to be regarded in the same light as the complaining member. This was enough to warn courts of justice against leaning to the unintelligible and magical influence of privilege. Even had committees of the House, or votes, or reports, been otherwise than he understood they were with reference to this case, he should have deemed it his duty to act as he now acted, if the facts, as they were presented to the Court, were



well founded. If, instead of wisely disclaiming the privilege in such a case, the House had decided in favour of it, he should have pursued his own course, and should have relied on the cases for his authority. There was no case in the books to justify the privilege asserted. The distinction between one class of contempts and another was one which he had deliberately taken, and had been of long standing in his mind. Let it not be supposed that he had rapidly disposed of the case when it came before the Court: cases of privilege were familiar to his mind. He had reviewed them in every form, in Parliament, and in courts of law. He had argued the greatest of them all,—that of “*Coleman v. Burdett*.” He was not, therefore, unprepared upon the subject, when, without argument, he committed Mr. Wellesley to the Fleet; but the result of the argument which he had now heard, confirmed his view of the case. He would make Mr. Beames a present of all his argument as to contempt for refusing to answer, or perform a specific act, for cutting timber, and the like. In matters such as these, referring to civil transactions, the court could not attack the person of the party disobeying. He might also leave that ingenious part of Mr. Beames’s argument, which went to establish that there was no distinction between a civil and a criminal contempt. The ground on which he rested his judgment was not the authority of lord Coke, who confined the privilege to cases of treason, felony, and a breach of the peace,—he drew his line in a different direction—higher on the scale. If the only ground of committal for contempt was a breach of the peace, then the court

could not commit for any contempt that was unaccompanied by a breach of the peace. There were many offences for which no man could doubt the right of courts of law to commit, which were not breaches of the peace. Perjury would be without punishment, as not falling within either of the heads of treason, felony, or breach of the peace. A member of Parliament was liable to indictment, if he had committed such an act of perjury as could be assigned. Now what qualification was there after the bill was found, after the trial and conviction, to prevent taking the member into custody, for there was no distinction in criminal cases between mesne process and execution? But if lord Coke’s doctrine were to prevail, there would be no imprisonment of a burgess or knight of the shire for perjury. What could be said of a crime equal to perjury,—prevarication on oath? Unless this occurred on a point material to the issue, no perjury would be committed, and the court could not order an indictment to be presented against the offender for perjury: but the order made in such cases was, that he stand committed for contempt of the court in committing so grave an offence against the administration of justice. Was it ever dreamt in the court of King’s Bench, that a member of Parliament, who so grossly forgot his honour as a member, and his duty as a man, should say to the Court—“True, I have prevaricated, but I am protected in doing so by my privilege?” Such a privilege would degrade and disgrace him who claimed it as a protection for perpetrating so noxious a defeasance of the administration of justice, that he ought at once to be hurried to a dungeon



for it, instead of being allowed to say—"My person is as sacred as the oath I have taken and broke." Far from being allowed such a protection, it was his lordship's belief and hope, that such a man should cease to be a member of Parliament by expulsion from the House. The line which his lordship drew was this—that in all civil cases, not accompanied by criminal incidents, the principle of privilege protected; but that privilege could not be urged against acts of a criminal nature. There was no privilege from the sentence of a court of competent jurisdiction after a conviction. Convictions were of two kinds—those which were had after a trial, and those which were summary. In the Earl of Shaftesbury's case, reported in the "State Trials," he was committed by the warrant of Parliament on a *habeas corpus*. The Court held, that it had no right to consider the form of the warrant, but Chief Justice Raynsford said, if the party in contempt was not committed by the Court, there was no punishment for him. So it would be in this case, if there were no breach of the peace. Taking this line of cases, some of them would be found to go a good way farther than was necessary for the present purpose. If the act savoured of criminality, it was enough. This line of distinction was recognized by the Court of King's Bench, in "Catmore v. Knatchbull," and in "Green v. Lord Grosvenor," in *Term Reports*. The former case was for the non-performance of an award, and the contempt consisted in breaking the order of the Court. The Court held, that the matter was of a civil nature, and would not grant a rule absolute to attach

the person of the defendant, who was a member of Parliament. But if a man were to go into the Court of King's Bench, and interrupt the business by addressing to the Court all the slander or indecency that wit or folly could invent, no doubt could exist that the Court would order its officer to seize and commit the person so offending. The whole power of the Court here rested on the contempt. The man, if only removed from the Court by the bare act of putting him out, suffered an imprisonment in law, which was as sufficient to establish the principle as if he were confined in prison for a long period. If it were otherwise, 1,100 men in this country would have a right to obstruct the proceedings of the courts of justice. They might exert the same right at sessions for licensing, and might make it the means of penal visitations in cases where their zeal or local interests might prompt them to interfere. The sheriffs' court of Hustings, which was held for political purposes, might be disturbed or overawed by upwards of 1,000 persons who might claim the right, individually, or in a mass, and the Court would have no remedy; as they might do so with impunity, if they did not commit a breach of the peace. His lordship referred to the case of "Wilkinson v. Bolton," which bore a strong analogy to the present, though it occurred at a worse period. He also cited the authority of Fitzherbert, in favour of a writ *de homine replegiando*; in which case it was held, that if the sheriff return that the defendant has eluded the plaintiff's body, a *capias in withernam* should issue to take the body *quousque*; and it was held, that a



peer was not privileged from this writ. He conceived that in all cases of contempt relating to the liberty or security of the persons of wards, lunatics, or officers of the Court, there would be no privilege to exempt from that prompt obedience which the process of the Court was intended to compel, and that the word *quousque*, as applied to the *capias in withernam*, applied to all, whether peers of the realm or common persons. The writ *de homine replegiando* was the old writ of *habeas corpus*. The Star Chamber, to whose proceedings he adverted reluctantly, had committed a peer. On the authority of all these cases,—on the still higher authority of principle and of reason, he had no doubt of the justness of the distinction which he had taken—not suddenly, not on the distinction of Lord Coke, as to treason, felony, and breach of the peace, which was inconsistent, and fruitful of bad consequences,—but on the true ground, that privilege could never extend to protect from punishment, nor from process, where its object was to deliver up a person wrongfully detained. On this ground the jurisdiction, at all events, might safely stand, and it would have been secure, though the votes of the committee and its report had not been so wise and judicious as they were. Yet if in these times they had been less judicious, temperate, and reasonable, and had denied the jurisdiction, he should have deemed it his duty to take into consideration the question of right and wrong. The question of the Court's jurisdiction had required a week's discussion, which was a proof that the claim of privilege was not clear, that it was the subject of

doubt and hesitation. In a case which seemed so extremely obscure, the argument as to the inconvenience might be answered by the question, whether a claim so doubtful should be allowed to exist, to the frustration of all the courts of judicature in this country, by 1,100 persons; whether there should be a prostration of justice at the feet of the 1,100; and whether this should be done for the sake of a doubtful, mischievous, fatal privilege.

---

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY,  
JUNE 15.

*Trial for Riot at Dundee.*

James Barnet, quarrier, John Jolly, seaman, Thomas Kettle, baker, James Findlay, hostler, John Tomlinson, flesher, Frederick Scott, watchmaker, and George Haggart, painter, were accused of mobbing and rioting, as also of assault, at Dundee, on the 28th and 29th of March. The riots arose out of an illumination to celebrate the second reading of the reform bill. [Vide *Chronicle* for March].

Barnet, Kettle, and Jolly, pleading guilty of mobbing and rioting on the 28th of March, and assaulting Thomas Hardie, as libelled, the Solicitor-general passed from the other charges against them.

The Court then proceeded to try Findlay, Tomlinson, Scott, and Haggart, for mobbing and rioting on the 29th of March, for the purpose of violently and illegally effecting the liberation of Kettle, Jolly, and Barnet, who had been imprisoned in the cells of the police-office, for the part they had taken in the disturbances of the previous day.

Mr. John Sturrock, one of the  
X 2



Justices of the Peace for the county of Forfar, stated that he granted a warrant for the committal of Barnett, Jolly, and Kettle to the cells; and went to the Police-office about seven o'clock on the evening of the 29th March, to take their declarations. In about an hour after, he proceeded to the Town-house, and on his way thither he saw great numbers of people assembled in the streets, who afterwards surrounded the Town-hall, and threw stones at the windows; saw several attacking the Police-office. He spoke to the people, stating that their conduct was a disgrace to the town and themselves, and begged they would desist; but they complained of the police, and of three men being made prisoners, and demanded their liberation. The witness then went on to describe the repeated attempts made to appease the mob, who continued to call for the liberation of the prisoners, and the dismissal of Mr. Home, the superintendant of Police, and Alexander Dow, one of the serjeants. After this disturbance had continued for some time, the justices present considered it prudent, under all the circumstances, to consent to set the prisoners at liberty; and witness and major Guthrie went to the Police-office for that purpose. On reaching the door of that office, they found the people beating it in with a large piece of wood as a battering ram. The people desisted when they learned the object of his and the major's visit; but on going up stairs, the key of the cell in which the prisoners were could not be found, and those outside, becoming impatient, renewed the assault with redoubled fury. He returned to the Town-house, telling the people as he passed why the prisoners were not

set free, but the violence continued. From the windows of the Town-house he saw a boat containing burning materials drawn into the area at the bottom of the Town-house stair; and at this time sticks and stones were thrown in at the windows. The smoke from the burning became so intolerable, that he left the room, and learned that an attempt was to be made on the Jail, which is within the same stair as the Town-house. Having made arrangements to resist this to the utmost, he was forced to go to the street, where he induced Mr. Hackney to address the crowd, who assured them that the prisoners' liberation had been effected, which by this time had taken place. The mob were for some time incredulous, but they at last removed the burning boat to the middle of the street, where it continued to burn till between two and three in the morning. Witness did not see the three prisoners actually liberated, but consented to their liberation, because he was satisfied they would be set free by the mob. His consenting was to prevent further mischief.

Major Guthrie, a justice of the peace for the county of Forfar, said, he witnessed a great deal of riotous proceedings in the streets of Dundee on the evening of the 29th of March. He went to the Town-house between eight and nine o'clock; at that time there was a great crowd in the High-street, and in about a quarter of an hour the mob became dense, and proceeded to throw stones and break windows. Shortly after this, he saw a boat dragged from the direction of Crichton-street, towards the Town-house, close to which it was brought. Nearly about the same time an attack was com-



menced on the Police-office, and a cry set up from the mob, to "release the prisoners or we will set fire to the Town-house." Finding that there were only three magistrates and about twenty or thirty constables opposed to a mob, Mr. Sturrock said they could not do better than release the prisoners; but he (witness) hesitated for some time, though at last he agreed, to prevent worse consequences. He and Mr. Sturrock then went down stairs, the people crying, "the magistrates are going to liberate the prisoners," and the crowd was very civil as they passed. Major Guthrie went on to state, that the keys of the cell could not be found, and that he and his brother magistrate were assaulted by the people while getting back to the Town-house. The mob now pushed the burning boat broadside on against the Town-house gate, which is of thick strong wood, and which they had previously got shut; but fearing the house would be set on fire, it was again opened, and several of those inside effected their escape. The actual rioters were but few in number, but the lookers-on were very numerous, and among the latter he took his place, finding that he could do nothing as a magistrate. While there, a well-dressed tradesman spoke to him thus, "Major Guthrie, you are a magistrate, why don't you release the prisoners and put an end to the disturbance?" Witness replied, that the magistrates were anxious to liberate the prisoners, but the key was lost. The tradesman rejoined, "If you are anxious, I am a blacksmith, and will find tools to force open the door, if you order it." The man went for his tools, and on his return, he and the witness proceeded to the Police-office,

before which there was a large fire, composed apparently of feather beds, and other furniture from the Police-office—that office was, at that time, in the complete possession of the rioters; they were, in fact, setting fire to it as he entered. On reaching the door of the cell with the blacksmith, he found Mr. Gray, a magistrate, and other persons, with a pick-axe, ineffectually trying to force their way in, and it was only with great difficulty the smith could open the door with a chissel and hammer—the lock would not pick. It was right to state that the smith said, before he would do any thing, he must have an order from witness, upon which he said, "I will absolve you from all blame." On Barnet, Jolly, and Kettle being liberated, they were civil and humble—they were very quiet, and exhibited nothing which led him to suppose they were in the most distant manner in communication with the mob outside. When he left the Police-office, the people had not desisted from destroying it; he spoke to them, and told them, that, their object being obtained, they ought to disperse. Some went for water to put out the fire, while others called out to burn the house; and from the windows of Budge's hotel he saw the people continue to put furniture and fire buckets taken from the Police-office on the fire.

Several other witnesses were examined, whose evidence went to prove the part taken by each of the prisoners in the riotous proceedings.

The Jury found all the prisoners guilty, but recommended Scott to the leniency of the Court. The sentences were, Findlay and Tomlinson to be transported for fourteen years, and Haggart for seven;



Scott to be confined in Bridewell for eighteen months. Barnet, Kettle, and Jolly, who had pleaded guilty to rioting on the 28th, and whose liberation was the object of the riot on the 29th, were sentenced to be imprisoned in the gaol of Dundee for six months.

---

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY,  
JULY 15.

*Riots at Haddington.*

Andrew Graham, Peter M'Guire, Richard Kemp, David Cleghorn, Alexander Neilson, David Kinghorn, and Alexander Home, were charged with mobbing and rioting, on the 25th of May, in the town of Haddington, with the intention of rescuing and setting at liberty George Murray and Samuel Mac-lauchlan, who were under examination before the sheriff, for a riot in Lauder.

The Solicitor-general said, that from every inquiry he had made, he was satisfied that Kinghorn was entirely innocent of the charges, and he was accordingly dismissed from the bar. Andrew Graham and Alexander Home were outlawed for non-appearance. The prisoner M'Guire pleaded guilty; Kemp, Cleghorn, and Neilson, not guilty.

W. Horne, esq. sheriff of Haddington—Went to Haddington in consequence of receiving instructions from the Lord Advocate to take precognitions regarding the Lauder business. Took precognitions on Monday the 23rd of May. On Tuesday the magistrates of Haddington authorized an illumination.—On Wednesday the precognition went on till between seven and eight o'clock in the evening, when an assemblage of young persons surrounded the Town-house.

Witness remarked the countenance of a young man, who appeared to be instigating the crowd. Was not at first much disturbed by the noise, but the crowd gradually increased—and what first attracted his attention was the breaking of one of the panes of glass in the window. He sent out one of the officers to say to the assemblage that the noise was very annoying. Soon after, a number of the windows in the Court-room were broken with stones thrown from the street. The mob was then much increased. The noise was increased tenfold, when a witness, who had been under examination, was dismissed. A minute or two after, a shout was raised, and a rush by the mob took place into the Court-room. At first the people did not come beyond the bar, and he asked what they meant, but got no answer from any one. The mob subsequently filled the whole of the Court-room, and it was ascertained that the intention was, to liberate two men in the record-room, of the names of M'Lauchlan and Murray, who were detained for further examination. The former had been examined, but he thinks Murray had not been examined. The door, which opened from the court-room into the record-room, was not at first locked, but soon after heard it locked from the inside. There were two doors, both of which were of cast-iron. This disturbance continued for about five minutes, and during that time several persons were endeavouring to force the door. Got upon a chair to remonstrate against the folly and danger of the proceedings of the people, but it was in vain to stop them, the noise was so great. Finding his remonstrance had no effect, he got into conversation



with several individuals, who were endeavouring to force the door. Those he spoke to said their intention was only to liberate the prisoner Murray. Had a good deal of conversation with Neilson, who said there was no intention of committing injury to any one, but that they must have Murray liberated. At this time Provost Dods and some other gentlemen came into the court-room, and used every exertion in their power to induce the people to desist; and by their exertions and persuasions the people left the room entirely at one time. But they very soon returned, more numerous and noisy than before. Witness observed one person striking the door. Provost Dods, and the gentlemen with him, again remonstrated, and got the people to retire, but they soon returned, and were as noisy as ever. There was a very great noise in the lobby, and at the door which opened into the record-room. Put a question to Provost Dods whether he was apprehensive that there was danger of life, if the door was not opened, but the Provost said, he thought there was no danger. Very soon after he heard that the door had been opened, and that the prisoners had been liberated. On learning this he ordered one of the officers to open the other door, and when he went into the room he found the upper part of the lobby door broken. The crowd soon left the room, and witness, Provost Dods, Mr. Riddell, and other gentlemen, went along the streets, and although the crowd was great, there was no attempt at assault of any kind. The only one of the prisoners witness spoke to was Neilson, he did not see the other two.

Archibald Todrick, esq. Procu-

rator Fiscal of Haddington, and several other witnesses gave a similar account of the disturbance, and proved that the prisoners had taken part in it.

The Jury without leaving the box returned a verdict unanimously finding the libel against the three panels proven; but earnestly and unanimously recommended them to the leniency of the Court. The sentence was, that they should be confined in Haddington jail for eighteen calendar months; that thereafter, Kemp and Cleghorn should find bail to keep the peace for five years, under a penalty of 60*l.*, and Neilson for the same period, under a penalty of 30*l.*—failing which, they were to be subjected to six months farther imprisonment. M'Guire was to be imprisoned six months.

---

#### HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY, EDINBURGH, JULY 11.

Ralph Forrester, lately a mercantile clerk, was charged with mobbing and rioting in the city of Edinburgh on the 3rd of May last, being the day on which the election of a member to represent the city in Parliament took place. The prisoner pleaded not guilty.

The right hon. William Allan, lord Provost of the city, was the first witness examined. His lordship stated, that he left the council chamber alone, immediately after the election, which closed about four o'clock. There was a great mob, which was highly excited, and thickly assembled from the door of the council chamber along the streets. The people were ill-disposed towards him, and expressed their disapprobation by loud murmurs and the throwing of various missiles, mud, &c. His lordship was



joined by some friends at the entrance to the Exchange. A woman called out, "You damned scoundrel, you are taking away our freedom." Witness was assailed with hooting and hissing, which increased as he advanced. On turning to go down the North-bridge, the mob became more furious, and seemed determined to break through the police officers who were escorting him, and a cry was raised of "throw him over the bridge." He considered his personal safety in danger: here a rush was made at him, particularly by one man, several times. He should know that man quite well. He (his lordship) rushed at this man and got hold of him, but his hat was knocked off, and he fell. When he reached Leith-street, observing the mob availing themselves of the metal on the newly Macadamized road, he thought it would be advisable to go into Mr. Christie's shop, where he remained about an hour. Stones were thrown at the windows by the mob on the street, and also on the terrace. He did not think at the time that it would have been safe to leave the shop without military to escort him, as the mob, though somewhat dispersed, was still considerable. A party of dragoons arrived, by which he was escorted home, the pelting and hooting still continuing, but he was not struck then. He paid little attention to particular expressions when in the square formed by the dragoons. His lordship did not recollect the prisoner as being one of the crowd.

Charles Mackenzie, a night watchman of the police, was on duty when the lord Provost left the Exchange. Witness was knocked down when the lord Provost came out, and had his baton taken from him, when he went to the police

office and reported to captain Stuart what had happened. He then armed himself with the foot of a stool instead of a baton, and went and overtook the lord Provost before he had reached the North-bridge. The mob was very violent; they called out "throw him over the bridge," and pressed in upon him. Witness knew the prisoner before that day; saw him among the mob opposite Mr. Allan's shop, and was distinctly certain of the man; saw him again on the North-bridge, opposite the centre of it. Witness was very near him at that time, when the mob was pressing in on the Provost, and the prisoner near him. The mob were waving their hats, and crying to knock him (meaning the Provost) down, and there were some stones thrown. Witness did not speak to the prisoner, who was squaring with his fists at the Provost, as if intending to strike him. Witness heard the prisoner say "throw him over the bridge," and were he desired to point out any of the ringleaders of the mob, he would have pitched on him as soon as any of the rest. Observed the mob cheer the prisoner. They became very violent when the Provost got near Christie's shop in Leith-street, where he was compelled to take refuge. Witness here spoke to the prisoner who was close at his back. While the sheriff was reading the riot act some one came before him and said "read h—, you b—." Before the sheriff had finished reading, there were stones thrown at him. Witness was at the sheriff's right hand, and he and another officer were clapping their hands on some of the mob desiring them to go away. Witness tapped the prisoner three times on the shoulder, desiring him to go



away for he was well known. Prisoner said he would go. Witness and the other officers were afterwards driven away with stones, and he, therefore, could not say if the prisoner went or not. The Provost was in the shop and remained a good while until the dragoons came. Witness did not see prisoner after leaving Christie's shop. When witness tapped his shoulder the prisoner was standing on the pavement a little below Christie's shop, and not doing any thing at the time.

James Wood, watchman, saw the prisoner after the Provost came out of Christie's shop. He came forward and shook his fist in the Provost's face, and witness took him by the arm and shoved him away from the place. Heard the prisoner say "Hiss," and "Fie, shame, vagabond!" to the Provost.

John Findlay, criminal officer of the police, also swore to the same facts, and considered it impossible to take a prisoner at the time. Witness said to lieutenant Harvey, "We had better take particular notice of some of them," and Mr. Harvey said, "I know one of them; I know Forrester;" at the same time pointing him out to witness. Last time he saw the prisoner that day was opposite the Caledonian theatre; he held up his fists more than once as they went along.

The jury returned a verdict, unanimously finding the prisoner guilty of mobbing and rioting, but the majority were of opinion that the prisoner was not so engaged till after the lord Provost quitted Mr. Christie's shop, which was tantamount to finding the charge of assaulting the lord Provost not proven.

The sentence was, that the pri-

soner should be imprisoned in the jail of Edinburgh for nine calendar months, and at the expiration of that period find security to the amount of 60*l.*, to keep the peace for five years, which failing, to be farther imprisoned three months.

---

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICIARY,  
DECEMBER 28.

Samuel Waugh and John Ramsay were put to the bar, charged with the murder of Alexander Ross, at Girvan, on the 12th of July last; they having, along with disorderly persons, banded together in clubs or associations, known by the name of Orange Lodges, resolved to walk in procession into or through the town of Girvan, notwithstanding they had been prohibited by the magistrates of that town from entering it in procession. The prisoners pleaded not guilty.

Andrew Hunter was eldest bailie of Girvan on the 12th July. Shortly before, there was a report of an Orange procession, which caused a good deal of alarm in Girvan. Special constables were sworn in on the morning of the 12th July to keep the peace; and on the 9th, a proclamation was made by the town officer, against the procession. At one time it was understood that a portion of the Girvan people were to join the procession, but the greater part were induced not to take part in it; and the master of one of the lodges intimated to him that they would not take part in it.

George M'Dead was drummer to the New-lodge, which met in John Ramsay's, Mason-row, Maybole; thinks two lodges assembled there. Did not see Mr. Ramsay taking charge of any of the lodges at his own house, but, betwixt



Maybole and Girvan, saw him putting the men in order. Saw numbers of persons having pistols and guns, but did not know any who had a gun, except Samuel Waugh. Recollects a message being brought to the procession a little before they reached Girvan, "not allowing them to come." They stopped a little, and it was then said among them that they would go forward and fight their way. They were then about a quarter of a mile from Girvan; they then went on, getting the order to advance. Did not hear who gave the order, but Ramsay marched them; and the men who had arms were ordered to go to the front. John Ramsay gave this order; saw one man who had a pistol go from the lodge. Witness was ordered to go in front in consequence. Some of them said that John Ramsay should not have taken the armed men to the front, but have left them to protect the flags. All this took place before they reached the Bridge Mill-toll. A number of the men had sticks. Witness was in the rear of the procession; and therefore did not know in what part of the procession Mr. Ramsay was. More lodges than the two which had met in Ramsay's had joined; there might be several hundreds of the Orangemen.

John Coffin, shoemaker, Ayr, was engaged in the procession as drummer to a lodge from Cross-hill to Salton-bridge. Marched for Girvan on the morning of the 12th of July, joined the Maybole lodges in Maybole, and marched out in procession. Two men with fowling pieces guarded the colours of the lodge he was with. When the procession reached Bridge Mill, they were formed four deep; and shortly after a message came from Girvan,

on which they formed six deep. Saw Ramsay taking an active part in arranging the lodges and giving orders. When there was a call "forward, men with arms," the two that were with the colours ran to the front. Did not see any armed men that day except the two who were with his lodge, and never saw Waugh have a gun in his hand that day. Before leaving the Garvald-bridge grey paper was sent for to ram down the ammunition—there might be sixpennyworth of it,—and it was distributed to two or three people about the lodge. Saw Ramsay going up and down the line of the procession, like a man taking a charge. Saw a man named Farrell, who had his hand hurt by an explosion of gunpowder. Heard a gun go off when near Girvan, but he left shortly after. Saw no gun loaded, nor any bullet or slug put into a gun.

Heard Mr. Ramsay say they should keep themselves in fine regulation, and not molest any person unless they were themselves molested. Ramsay was in front when the armed men were ordered to the front. The gun was fired a short distance from Girvan, and where the road diverges to New Dailly. Heard no other gun fired. Saw one of the tylers have his lip cut from the stones thrown by the Girvan people. The stones fell among them just like a shower of hail, and this throwing was before the shot was fired. Had acted as drummer to the same lodge for eleven years, and had been once before at Girvan with them. No shots were fired on the procession while he was with them.

Gilbert Gray went with the special constables out of Girvan to meet the procession, which they met at the separation of the roads.



Saw both the prisoners there. Mr. Ramsay came forward and spoke to the constables, and while in conversation a number of stones were thrown from the Girvan side: stones were thrown back again from the Orange party. The Orangemen were then ordered by some person whom he did not know to go forward; Ramsay was the person who seemed to speak for the party. A little after a shot was fired, as if in consequence of an order. Saw the shot fired by Waugh, and immediately after saw Ross lean forward and fall. That was the only shot which was fired at that time.

James M'Lure, was a special constable of Girvan, and went out on the 12th July to the sheddings of the road to Dailly, where they were ordered to stop: the procession was coming right on, but stopped, when James Henderson had some conversation with Ramsay. Heard Henderson say he would conduct the men by the back road, and heard some one say they were to lower their colours. The colours were not lowered, nor did the procession go up the back road. Ramsay was in front, and witness was at the turn. The first stone witness saw was thrown among the Orangemen. A shower of stones was thrown by the Orange party among the constables, and stones were thrown in return from parties in the fields, but the constables were on the road. A scuffle took place on the stones being thrown; a man was struck with a stone beside Ramsay, who called out "fire." A shot in consequence went off. Did not see who fired the shot; immediately thereafter he observed Ross put his hand to the lower part of his belly and say, "My God, I am shot,"

and fall forward. It was not the man that was struck who fired. Was on the opposite side of the road from Ross when he was struck. The guns were not immediately in front, but there were a number of swords; Ramsay had a sword or a staff. It was the first shot fired that killed Ross. The Girvan people had no fire-arms. Ross, when he was struck, was doing nothing violent against any person. He was merely endeavouring to put back the crowd.

James Farrell, weaver at Cross-hill, went with the procession from Maybole. As they approached Girvan, they saw a mob of people before them, who threw stones. Immediately after the stones were thrown he heard the word "fire" given by more than two or three people. Observed Waugh step to the front, level his piece towards the crowd and fire. Saw a man instantly fall, but whether from the effect of that shot he could not say, because more men fired. It was not more than a second after Waugh fired, that he saw Ross fall. Immediately after Waugh fired, saw him struck with a stone and blood on his cheek; did not see him struck before he fired, nor anybody meddling with him, only the stones flying very thick. After the man fell, the Girvan people gave way, and the Orange-men went into the town.

Several other witnesses corroborated these statements.

James Henderson, was one of the councillors of Girvan in July last. Was a little alarmed about the procession.—There were some special constables sworn in. There were no arms given to any of the Girvan people. Saw none of them with arms. Some of the special



constables went out when the procession was near the town. Witness followed and came up with them. Does not know that they were directed to go out. Met the people in procession. Witness went forward and conversed with some of the parties in the procession on the impropriety of their coming into town during the present agitation. Spoke to those who seemed to be the leaders. Ramsay the prisoner was one of them, and his conversation was chiefly directed to him. Told him, that the sheriff and magistrates would take it as a favour, if they would go round by a back way, which witness pointed out. The answer was, that they were willing to go any road he directed, so that they met their friends. Witness told them, he observed they had arms in their hands, which, the sheriff had said, was illegal. Ramsay said, they would deliver up their arms; but some parties behind him cried out "No!" and to "push forward." Ramsay remonstrated with those men, and they stood still a little. They then all proceeded forward towards the town by the back road—the road to Dailly. Witness was in front of the procession, and his back was at that time towards it. He heard a noise behind him, and turning round, saw stones flying between the parties on both sides. Turned back with his hat in his hand, and waived to the constables to drive the Girvan people back; and turning round to speak to the procession, saw a gun presented. Looked round to see if it was aimed at any person; but before he could do so, the shot went off, and Alexander Ross fell. Waugh fired the gun. Did not hear any order given to fire at that time. Did not observe where Ramsay was

at the time. The Girvan constables were armed with batons. Did not see any of them at first with either fire-arms or swords. Witness's conversation was chiefly with Ramsay, who behaved as if he was the leader. The Orangemen seemed to respect him as such.

Did not think he was disposed to excite the Orangemen, but rather to restrain them. He readily went into the proposal of going by a back road.

The jury returned a verdict, finding by a plurality, Waugh guilty of murder, and, unanimously, the libel not proven against Ramsay.

Waugh was sentenced to be executed at Ayr on the 19th of January.

---

OLD BAILEY SESSIONS,  
DECEMBER 1.

*Murder for the purpose of selling  
the Bodies for Dissection.*

John Bishop, Thomas Williams, and James May, were indicted for the murder of Charles Ferrair, otherwise called Carlo Ferrair, on the 4th of November. Another account charged them with the murder of a male person, name unknown. The deceased was an Italian boy. The prisoners, at least two of them, were resurrection-men, and were understood to have committed the murder for the purpose of procuring a body to sell for dissection.

William Hill stated, that he was a porter at the dissecting-room of King's College. On the 5th of November last, the bell of the gate was rung at about a quarter past twelve o'clock; found Bishop and May at the gate; had known them before. When witness opened the door, May asked him if he wanted



anything; witness said, not particularly. Asked him what he had got; he said a male subject. Witness asked of what size, and what price; he said it was a boy of fourteen, and that he wanted twelve guineas for it. Witness said, he did not want it much, but he would see Mr. Partridge, the demonstrator, who came down to see the body. Witness took them to a room, where Mr. Partridge joined them. They did not then produce any body. There was a difference at first about the price, but witness afterwards agreed with them. May said they should have it for ten guineas. Mr. Partridge then left witness alone with them. Witness went to Mr. Partridge to know whether he would decide upon having it. When witness returned, he told them that Mr. Partridge would give them nine guineas for it. May said, he would be d—d if it should come in for less than ten; he was tipsy at the time. May went outside the door. Bishop then said to witness, "Never mind May, he is drunk, it shall come in for nine, in half an hour." May was near enough to hear him. They then went away, and returned in the afternoon, all three together, with a porter named Shields. When witness then saw them, the hamper was on the head of the porter. They were received in a room, and May and Bishop took the hamper into another room, where they opened it; the body was in a sack; May and Bishop said, it was a very fresh one; May was tipsy, and turned the body carelessly from the sack; saw that the body was fresh; but saw something else about it which induced him to go to Mr. Partridge; he asked them what the body had died of? May said it was no business of theirs or of wit-

ness's. It was not in such a form as bodies usually are when taken from a coffin; the left arm was bent, and the fingers were clenched; witness told Mr. Partridge what he had seen, and what he thought; Mr. Partridge returned and saw the body, without seeing them; he examined the body and went to the secretary. He returned to May and Bishop, and shewed them a 50*l.* note, telling them that he must get that changed, and he would pay them. Bishop, seeing that Mr. Partridge had some gold in his purse, said, "Give me what money you have in your purse, and I will call for the rest on Monday." May also offered to get change for it, but Mr. Partridge declined that and left them. He returned in about a quarter of an hour or twenty minutes. The men remained. In the interim, a body of police had been sent for, who now apprehended them. When witness was leaving the room, Bishop said to him privately "Pay me in presence of Williams only eight guineas, and give me privately the other guinea, and I will give you half-a-crown." The body was taken to the Police-office by Mr. Thomas; it had not been laid out; there was no saw-dust on the back of the head.

Mr. Richard Partridge, demonstrator of anatomy at the King's college, was there on Saturday, the 5th of November. His attention was first called to the body by Hill. Examined the external appearance of the body, and found some marks and circumstances of suspicion. These were the swollen state of the jaw—the blood-shot eyes—the freshness of the body—rigidity of the limbs. There was likewise a cut over the left temple. Looked at the lips, which were



swollen. Noticed nothing else in the appearance of the body. Witness went to the police before the 50*l.* note was produced. On his return, witness showed May and Bishop a note, at the bottom of the stairs leading to the anatomical part of the college. Proposed that change should be got of the 50*l.* note, with a view to detain them till the police came. Saw the body afterwards, when in the custody of Mr. Thomas, in company with Mr. Beaman and other gentlemen. The muscles were then rigid. The wound on the temple was superficial, and did not injure the bone. That was the only appearance of external injury; at least there was no other external mark. Between the scalp and the bone there was some blood congealed. On opening the body, the whole of the contents of the chest and abdomen were in a healthy condition. Did not know what were the contents of the stomach, which was filled. The spinal part of the brain at the back of the head, and the whole brain was also examined; the brain was perfectly healthy, as far back as the spine; in cutting through the skin and muscles of the neck, there was discovered a great deal of coagulated blood, and upon removing the back part of the bony canal which concludes the spine of the back, a quantity of congealed blood was also found in that; that was opposite the place where the blood had been found in the muscles of the neck; congealed blood was also found in the rest of the spine; the spinal marrow or cord appeared perfectly healthy; thought that those marks of violence were sufficient to have caused death; violence had been exerted which had affected the spinal cord. Be-

lieved that those appearances had been caused by some violence on the back of the neck. Believed that a blow from a stick would have produced similar effects. Could not say whether that would produce instant death, but it certainly would have produced a rapid one.

Cross-examined.—Saw nothing in the external appearance that indicated a violent death.

Mr. G. Beaman, surgeon, of James-street, Covent-garden, first saw the body on the 5th of November, at twelve o'clock at night. Examined it carefully. It appeared to have died very recently. The weather was then favourable to the preservation of bodies. In his judgment the body had not been dead more than thirty-six hours. The face appeared swollen; the eyes full, prominent, and blood-shot; the tongue swollen, and protruded between the lips; the teeth had all been extracted; the gums bruised and bloody, and portions of the jaws had been broken out with the teeth. There were also appearances of blood having issued from the gums. Thought that the teeth must have been taken out within two or three hours after death. Examined the throat, neck, and chest very particularly; no marks of violence externally apparent there. Saw a cut on the forehead; it was a wound over the left eyebrow, about three quarters of an inch long, through the skin to the bone. Pressed the part, and a small quantity of blood oozed from the wound. Blood might have issued from the wound if the latter had been caused by throwing the body out of a sack after death. It was serum, tinged with blood. Saw the body again at two o'clock on the Sunday afternoon. The limbs were decidedly stiff on



the Saturday night, but not so stiff on the Sunday; should think that it had not been laid out. It was lying on a board irregularly placed when witness first saw it in Covent Garden church-yard, near the station-house. Soon after eight on that evening, witness, with Mr. Partridge and other gentlemen, further examined it. He cleansed with a sponge the neck and chest; found no scratch or any other mark of violence there. He then removed the scalp, with the top of the skull. They detected a patch of blood, of the size of a crown-piece. This appearance must have been caused by a blow given during life. The brain was next examined, and its appearance was perfectly healthy; the body was then turned, for the purpose of examining the spinal marrow, and on removing the skin from the back part of the neck, a considerable quantity of coagulated blood (witness thought at least four ounces) was found among the muscles; that blood must have been effused while the subject was alive. On removing a portion of the spine to examine the spinal marrow, a quantity of coagulated blood was lying in the canal, which, by pressure in the spinal marrow, must have caused death. There was no injury to the bone of the spine. All these appearances, and death, would have followed the blow of an obtuse instrument of any kind. The chest and the cavity were minutely examined. There was about an ounce of blood in the spinal canal. The heart was empty, which is very unusual, and denoted sudden death; that is, death nearly instantaneous — in two or three minutes, and not longer. The stomach contained a tolerably full meal, which smelt slightly of rum,

and digestion had been going on at the time of death. Should think that death occurred about three hours after the meal, from the appearances. Removed the stomach. The centre of the stomach appeared perfectly healthy. Ascribed the death of the boy to a blow on the back of the neck; this was the result of the whole of his examination, and was verified by precisely the same appearances as witness had seen on animals.

Frederick Tyrell, esq., one of the surgeons of St. Thomas's Hospital, confirmed the opinion of Mr. Beaman; he said he had never seen any case of serous apoplexy without marks on the brain.

By the Court.—The appearance described in the present case could only have been produced by violence.

John Earl Rogers, an inspector of police, stated that, on the 5th of November last, he received a body from the witness Hill, and gave it into the custody of Mr. Thomas. Had also the hamper, which he delivered to Mr. Thomas.

Joseph Sadler Thomas, superintendent of police—On the 5th of November received information at the station-house, which induced him to dispatch a party of police to the King's college. They brought back with them Bishop and Shields, and afterwards May and Williams. Shields has been discharged. When the body was in the hamper, witness asked May what he had to say, as he was charged on suspicion of having improper possession of a subject. He said that he had nothing at all to do with it. It was the property of Bishop, whom he merely accompanied to get the money. Bishop said that it was his, and that he was merely taking it from St. Thomas's Hospital to



King's College. Asked Bishop, in the first instance, what he was; he replied that he was "a — body-snatcher." Williams said, he knew nothing of it, but merely went to see the King's College. Bishop and May appeared in liquor. May was brought in by all-fours, struggling violently. The body was placed on the table. It appeared to have died recently; blood was trickling from the mouth, and the teeth were gone. Went to the house of Mr. Mills in Newington-causeway, on the following Tuesday; received from him twelve teeth. (Witness here produced the teeth in a pasteboard box.) Went before that to Nova Scotia Gardens. Found in the back room of the ground-floor a trunk. Went again on the 20th, and made further examinations. Found in the front parlour a hairy cap covered with dirty linen, not apparently by design. Took possession of the cap, the hamper, and the sack. (All these articles were produced. The hamper appeared not more than three feet long by two broad and two deep.)

Henry Lock, waiter at the Fortune of War public-house, in Giltspur-street, knew the prisoners. Saw the prisoners there on the Friday, with a man who was a stranger to witness. They stayed till twelve o'clock, and then went away. The prisoners returned about three o'clock, without the strange man. They then stayed till about five o'clock, and went away again till about eight o'clock on the same evening, with another man, who appeared to be a coachman. The latter had something to drink, and left them. They were until nine o'clock in the tap-room; before the coachman left, one of the prisoners said, he had

had a ride; at nine o'clock May went to the bar, and had something in a silk handkerchief, which witness afterwards saw to be teeth; May found water on the outside of the handkerchief, and rubbed the handkerchief together; they looked like young teeth, and witness said that they were worth a few shillings, when May said, that they were worth two pounds to him; they all left together a short time afterwards: on the next evening he saw Bishop, Williams, and Shields, at about eight o'clock; Bishop asked Williams what they should do for a hamper, and asked Shields to go and fetch one; Shields refused, and Bishop then went and got one himself.

Thomas Wigley—Was at the public-house at about half-past seven o'clock on the 4th of November.—Bishop and May came in and sat down opposite each other. They entered into conversation together.—Bishop said to May, "What do you think of our new one? Did he not go up to him well? Was't he a game 'un?" May replied, "I don't know what you mean." Bishop rejoined, "That's all right then." They saw witness there in the corner at that time.—May sat down, and had a handkerchief rubbing in his hand. Williams came in, and Bishop said, "There he is; I knew he would come; I knew he was a game 'un." Bishop seemed to have been drinking. Bishop and Williams went out first. Just after Bishop came in, he said to May, just before May went out for the handkerchief, "You stick to me, and I'll stick to you."

James Seagrave, the driver of a cabriolet, stated, that on the evening of the 4th, he was on the stand in the Old Bailey; had put



his horses' nose-bags on, and had gone to the watering-house to get his own tea. May and Bishop came in at the time. May asked if he wanted a job, and said that he wanted a cab. He led witness by the skirt of his coat to the side of the cart. May said, that he wanted witness to fetch a stiff 'un, which witness believes meant a dead body. Witness asked what he would stand? He replied, "A guinea." Told him that he had not finished his tea, and the horse had not eaten his corn. May then said, "We will take tea together." Bishop then joined them, and they went into the house to tea. A person in the room nudged witness's elbow, and told him that he must mind what he was at, as they were snatchers. Went out afterwards and drove to the bottom of the rank to get out of their way; looked round and saw May and Bishop going up the rank of coaches. Left them apparently bargaining with a coachman.

Thomas Taverner, waterman to the coach-stand, saw on the above day May and Bishop who came to him on the stand, and asked where the cab-man was, meaning Seagrave. May asked the question, and witness told him that he was getting his tea. Fetched out Seagrave from the watering-house. Both the prisoners had smock-frocks on. It was just dark in the evening. Seagrave came out and spoke to them, but witness did not know what it was. Seagrave, however, said, "I'll have nothing at all to do with you," and went in to get his tea.

Edward Chandler.—Was, on the 4th of November last, waiter at the King of Denmark, in the Old-Bailey, which is the watering-house. Served Bishop and May

with tea at about five o'clock. Saw Seagrave there; May and Bishop had half a pint of gin. Saw May put some gin into Bishop's tea. He said, "Are you going to hocus (or Burke) me?" Had known May and Bishop before.

Henry Mann, a hackney-coachman.—Was, on the 4th, on the stand in Bridge-street, Blackfriars. Knew May before then. Saw him that night with a stranger to witness. May asked witness if he would take a fare to Bethnal-green? Witness replied that he would not, because he knew what May was.

George Hissing, a boy of about twelve years old, deposed that his father kept the Crab-tree public-house, in the Hackney-road. Saw on the Friday a chariot draw up opposite his father's house, which is near the Nova Scotia Gardens. Saw Williams standing on the fore-wheel of the chariot, talking with the coachman. The chariot remained ten or fifteen minutes. Saw Williams at that time coming from Nova Scotia Gardens, in which direction he had gone. He got into the chariot. Witness saw a man, whom he did not know, helping Bishop, whom he did know, in carrying a heavy sack. It was put by Bishop, Williams, and another man, into the chariot. Bishop and the other man then got in, and the chariot drove up towards Crab-tree row, and Shoreditch Church.

Thomas Trainer corroborated the last witness.

Ann Channell was passing the Crab-tree on the above night. Saw three men get out of the chariot. They went down Nova Scotia Gardens. One stopped and spoke to the coachman, and then ran after the others. Did not see them afterwards. The first two had



smock-frocks on, and the other had a pipe in his mouth.

Thomas Davis, porter to the dissecting-room in Guy's Hospital, saw May and Bishop at about seven o'clock on the Friday evening; May brought in a sack, and asked him if he wanted to purchase a subject. Witness replied that he did not, and they then asked him to let it remain till next morning. It was, consequently, locked up there during the night. Saw them the next morning in the hospital, at about eleven o'clock. Left the hospital and found on his return the sack which appeared to contain a dead body. Saw a portion of a small foot protruding through a hole in the sack; it appeared like that of a youth or a woman. It did not appear large enough for a man's foot. Could not swear to the sack produced. It was such a one.

James Weeks, assistant to the last witness, deposed to having given up the sack to them—the sack was very like the one produced; when they took it away Williams and Shields were with May and Bishop; May and Bishop had each requested him not to allow either of them to have it without the other; they took it away in a hamper similar to that produced.

James Appleton, curator of Mr. Grainger's anatomical theatre, Webb-street, Southwark, knew all the prisoners, and saw Bishop and May at the theatre on the Friday night about half past seven o'clock. They said that they had a very fresh male subject, a boy about fourteen years of age. Witness declined purchasing it. They came on the next morning, about eleven, and made the same offer, which was again declined.

Thomas Mills, dentist, of 32, Bridgehouse-place, Newington-causeway, deposed: on the 5th of November, May called on him about nine in the morning, and offered twelve human teeth, six from the upper, and six from the lower jaw. He asked a guinea for the set. Witness said, that one of them was chipped, and did not belong to the same set. He replied, "Upon my soul to God they all belonged to the same head not long since, and the body was never buried." Afterwards discovered that some of the flesh and pieces of the jaw adhered to the teeth, and it appeared that much force had been used to wrench them out. Witness said, that they were a youngset. He replied, "The fact is, that they belonged to a boy about fourteen or fifteen years of age."

Augustus Brunn examined, through the medium of an interpreter. I knew a boy named Carlo Ferrier, and brought him from Italy two years ago; he was about fourteen years old, and lived with me about six weeks after he came here. The 28th of July, 1830, was the last time I saw the boy alive. He then lived at Mr. Elliot's, No. 2, Charles-street, Drury-lane.—On the 19th of November, I saw the body of the boy in St. Paul's burial ground, Covent-garden, and I believe it to be the body of that boy; the size and the hair were similar, but the face was disfigured.

Cross-examined.—If I had known nothing about this occurrence, and had seen the body, I should be of opinion he was "my own."

By Mr. Justice Littledale.—He was in his fifteenth year. I have not seen him for fifteen months. He might have grown a little in that time but not much.



By Mr. Curwood—At first sight, if anybody had asked me who the body was, the face was so disfigured I could not tell.

Joseph Peraguari sworn.—I get a living by playing an organ and pipes in the street. I knew Carlo Ferrier, and used to see him every day in Charles-street, Drury-lane. His sister lived in Scotland, and died there. He came to London on the 22nd of May, 1830, and I have known him all that time. I last saw him alive in the Quadrant, Regent-street, at two o'clock on a Saturday, four weeks before I saw his body at the Station-house. When I saw him in the Quadrant, he had a little cage round his neck, with two white mice in it. He was in the habit of wearing a cap, but I cannot say whether it was of cloth, leather, or skin. The leather shade of the cap produced was of foreign manufacture.

Mary Peraguari, wife of the preceding witness, stated, that on Tuesday, November 1, she saw the deceased in Oxford-street, near Hanover-square. He had a cage like a squirrel-cage, and two white mice in it. She did not speak to him. He wore a cap, but she could not tell what sort of one it was. She had seen the body of that boy at the station-house in Covent-garden.

Andrew Colla, bird-cage maker—I knew the deceased boy, by seeing him in the streets, and saw him lately in Oxford-street; I have seen the body at the station-house, and believe it to be the body of the boy I have seen in the streets. When I saw him in Oxford-street he had white mice in a cage, and a tortoise. The cap produced was similar to that which he wore. He also wore a blue coat and grey trowsers, with a large

patch on the left knee of the latter.

(The trowsers which had been dug up in Bishop's garden, were here produced.)

The witness examined them, and stated, he believed them to be the same as those the deceased had worn, and he pointed out the patch on the knee of them.

John King, a boy, sworn.—I live at No. 3, Crab-tree-road, near Nova Scotia Gardens. I remember one day when my mother washed, seeing a boy near Nova Scotia Gardens. I believe it was the Thursday before Guy Fawkes's day. I was looking out of the window, and the boy had something, but my mother would not let me go to see what it was. I believe it was a little cage that he had, and it was slung from his neck by a string. He was standing still. He had a brown cap, with the leaf or shade lined with green, exactly like this cap (the one produced.) I was looking at him for a few minutes.

Martha King, sister to the last witness, aged eleven years, saw the Italian boy, as described by her brother. He was not one minute's walk from Bishop's house, and she had never seen him since.

John Randall, a labourer.—I live near Nova Scotia Gardens. On Thursday morning, November 3, I saw an Italian boy, about nine or ten o'clock, near Nova Scotia Gardens. He was standing under the window of the Bird-cage public-house, and had a box or cage, with two white mice. He had on a blue coarse jacket, and a brown fur cap, but I did not notice his trowsers. The cap and jacket were similar to those produced.

William Woodcock, a boy, stated that he lived with his father, at



No. 2, Nova Scotia Gardens, next door to Bishop's house; he knew Williams, and had seen him there ten times, and had also seen Williams's wife washing in Bishop's house; saw Williams there two or three days before Guy Fawkes' day, walking in the garden, smoking a pipe.

Abraham Keymer, landlord of the Feathers, Castle-street, Bethnal-green — On the night of Thursday, the 3rd of November, Bishop, and I believe Williams also, came to my house. It was near twelve o'clock. My house is about 200 yards from Nova Scotia Gardens. They had a quartern of rum and half a gallon of beer, and I lent them a can to carry it. The can produced was that which he lent them.

William Woodcock.—I went to reside at No. 2, Nova Scotia Gardens, on the 17th of October, next door to Bishop. Williams, I have reason to believe, also lived with Bishop. I lived in No. 2, until after the prisoners were apprehended. I know Williams, but did not know Bishop until I saw him at Bow-street. On Thursday, the 3rd of November, I went to bed about half-past nine o'clock. In the course of the night, probably about four hours and a-half after I had gone to bed, I was awakened by hearing footsteps which I thought were at the back of my premises, but I distinctly heard three men's footsteps in the parlour of No. 3, (Bishop's house.) I remained in bed and heard a scuffle, which lasted for one or two minutes, at the furthest, and then all was silent. The scuffling was in the same room in which I heard the footsteps. Afterwards I heard Bishop's side-door open, and also heard the footsteps of two men.

There is a side door to Bishop's house. The persons after leaving Bishop's house, I heard come round to the front, and pass by my house. After they were gone, I heard the footstep of one person in the house. When those two persons returned to the house, I distinctly heard the voices of three persons, one of which I knew to be that of Williams. After that, all became still again, and I went to rest.

Cross-examined.—I believe the wall between the two houses is but four inches thick. The struggle that I heard I considered at the time to be a family quarrel.

By Mr. Justice Littledale.—Not more than a minute and a half elapsed from the time of the two men leaving, until their return.

Joseph Higgins, a new police constable.—On the 9th of November, in consequence of some instructions, I went to No. 3, Nova Scotia Gardens; and on searching it I found two crooked chisels, a brad-awl and a file. There appeared to be blood on the brad-awl, which at that time looked fresh. I searched May's premises, No. 4, Dorset-street, New Kent-road on the 11th, and found a pair of breeches, which had, on the back part, marks of blood, which appeared to be fresh. There was also a waistcoat with marks of clay on it. On the 19th I went again to Bishop's house with James Wadey.

Mr. Mills, the dentist, was recalled, and examined by Chief Justice Tindal.—The teeth had been forced out: I should think the brad-awl now produced would afford great facility in forcing out the teeth.

The evidence of Higgins was then continued.—When we went to Bishop's house, on the 19th,



we searched the garden behind the house; we first attempted it with an iron rod, but finding something impeding it, I desired Wadey to dig, and a jacket, trowsers, and a small shirt, were found; that was about five yards from the back door. In another part we dug up a blue coat, a pair of trowsers with the braces attached to them, a striped waistcoat, which appeared to be a man's, and taken in for a boy, with marks of blood on the collar and shoulder, and a shirt that was torn up the front. (The witness here produced all those things.) The clothes are those which would be useful to boys like the deceased. There were ashes over the place where the clothes had been buried.

Edward Ward, a little boy, six and a half years old, was next examined.—My father lives in Nova Scotia Gardens. I remember last Guy Fawkes' day, at which time I was in the habit of going to school. I remember my mother giving me a half holiday. I went to Bishop's house. Bishop has three children, two of them boys. On that day I saw the children in the house, and they showed me a cage with two little white mice; the cage turned round. I had often played with Bishop's children before, but never saw them with a cage of white mice before that.

John Ward, an elder brother of the preceding witness stated, that what his brother had just related took place on Friday, the 4th of November. His brother on that day told him what he had seen.

Mr. Corder, Vestry Clerk of St. Paul's, Covent-garden, examined.—A coroner's inquest was held on the deceased on the 8th of November, and closed on Thursday, the 10th. In the course of the ex-

amination Bishop was introduced, and after a suitable caution, made a statement which the coroner put down in writing. — I also told Bishop, before he said any thing, that the inquiry might affect his life. After that he made a voluntary declaration.—(The witness here read it: in it Bishop stated that he got the body from a grave, and assigned as a reason for not telling where the grave was, that two watchmen who knew of it, had large families.)—May also made a declaration: he stated that he had been into the country whence he had brought two subjects which he took to Mr. Grainger's, and thence to Guy's Hospital; that he met with Bishop, who told him he had got a good subject which he was offered eight guineas for, and if he, May, could sell it, he should have all above nine guineas for himself. This he agreed to, and his account of the subsequent transactions was similar to that given in the early part of the evidence.

Mr. William Burnaby, clerk of Bow-street police office, sworn.—When the brad-awl was produced at Bow-street, May said, "That is the instrument with which I punched the teeth out."

John Kirkham, police constable, stated, that when the inquest was sitting, he had charge of the prisoners in the station-house. Behind where they sat, there was a printed bill posted, referring to the matter. Bishop looked at the bill, and then leaned over Williams to speak to May; he said to May, "It was the blood that sold us." Bishop then got up, and looked a second time at the bill, and referring to the words "marks of violence," he said these marks were only breakings out in the skin.



Mr. Thomas, the superintendent, was recalled by Mr. Bodkin. — When I first saw the body, there were patches of dirt on several parts. There were also marks on the left arm, as though they were the impression of fingers, and it appeared to me as if the chest had been pressed in. There was a stream of blood from the forehead down the face to the breast.

Mr. Adolphus stated that this was the case for the prosecution.

The prisoners were then severally called upon for their defence.

Bishop stated, that he was 33 years old, and had a wife and three children. He was formerly a carrier at Highgate, but for the last twelve years he had obtained a living by supplying the various hospitals and anatomical schools with dead bodies, but he declared that he never was in any manner concerned in improperly obtaining subjects. He had been in the habit of getting bodies from work-houses, and sometimes with the clothes remaining on them. All the gardens about Nova Scotia Gardens were easy of access, and were only divided by a low dwarf railing. As to the wearing-apparel found in the garden, he knew nothing; but, regarding the cap, he said he should prove that his wife purchased it of Mrs. Doddswell, who kept a sale-shop in Hoxton Old Town. As respected the prisoners Williams and May, they knew nothing of the manner in which he got the body, and he declared that he only got it in the way by which subjects were usually obtained.

Williams, in his defence, stated, that he knew nothing of the means by which the body was procured by Bishop, who invited him to go to King's College.

He, Williams, was not in the habit of dealing in subjects, but got his living by working as a glass-blower.

May, in his defence, said, he was 30 years old, and was married, and formerly was a butcher, but for the last six years he had followed the trade of dealing in subjects and supplying them to hospitals. On the day when he met Bishop at the Fortune of War public-house, it was merely by accident, when Bishop asked him where he could sell a good subject, stating that he had been offered eight guineas for it. He (May) told him, as was the fact, that he had sold two to Mr. Davis at ten guineas each, the day before, and he would try if Mr. Davis would buy that one. Bishop told him he should have all above nine guineas for himself, and then he agreed to endeavour to sell it. He assured the jury that he never asked, and of course he never knew, how Bishop got possession of the body.

Rosina Carpenter stated, that she lived in Nag's-Head-court, Golden-lane. On Thursday, November 3, between four and five o'clock, in the afternoon, May came to her house, and remained with her until nearly twelve o'clock the next day, not once going out during that time.

Cross-examined.—May had several times passed his nights with her; she did not know whether he was married or not.

Sarah Triesly, who was examined for the prosecution, was called by Mr. Barry. She had never seen any white mice in Bishop's house.

Mary Doddswell, wife of George Doddswell, of 56, Hoxton Old Town, sworn.—I keep a clothes and sale-shop for the sale of se-



cond-hand goods. My husband is a journeyman pastry-cook. I know Bishop's wife, and sold her a cap two years ago; I should know it again now; it was a cloth-cap with a black front (the cap produced for the prosecution was a fur-cap.)

Bishop—My wife purchased two caps of her.

Mrs. Doddswell.—I never sold but one cap to Mrs. Bishop. I know nothing of Bishop or his family, but that his daughter lived servant with me twelve months ago.

Mary Anne Hall, of No. 4, Dorset Street, New Kent Road, where May lived, stated, that on the 30th of October May went into the country, and she saw no more of him until the following Wednesday night, and then he went to bed. The next morning he went out and did not return until the Friday night at half-past eleven o'clock.

Mr. Thomas stood up, and addressing the court, said, he wished to repeat something he had said at Bow Street. The blood on the breeches found at May's residence was not perfectly dry when they were found.

Chief Justice Tindal having summed up, the jury found the three prisoners guilty of murder. In court, the verdict was received with silence, but in a moment it was conveyed to the immense multitude assembled outside, who evinced their satisfaction at the result by loud and continued cheering and clapping of hands. To such an extent was this expression of the popular feeling carried, that the windows of the court were obliged to be closed, in order that the voice of the Recorder might be heard in passing

sentence of death, which was ordered to be carried into execution on Monday the 5th.

Between their trial and execution, Bishop and Williams, or Head, made, in presence of the Under-sheriff, the following

#### CONFESSIONS.

*Newgate, Dec. 4, 1831.*

I, John Bishop, do hereby declare and confess, that the boy supposed to be the Italian boy was a Lincolnshire boy. I and Williams took him to my house about half-past ten o'clock on the Thursday night, the 3rd of November, from the Bell, in Smithfield. He walked home with us. Williams promised to give him some work. Williams went with him from the Bell to the Old Bailey watering-house, whilst I went to the Fortune of War. Williams came from the Old Bailey watering-house to the Fortune of War for me, leaving the boy standing at the corner of the court by the watering-house in the Old Bailey. I went directly with Williams to the boy, and we walked then all three to Nova Scotia Gardens, taking a pint of stout at a public-house near Holloway-lane, Shoreditch, on our way, of which we gave the boy a part; we only stayed just to drink it, and walked on to my house, where we arrived at about eleven o'clock. My wife and children and Mrs. Williams were not gone to bed, so we put him in the privy, and told him to wait there for us. Williams went in and told them to go to bed, and I stayed in the garden. Williams came out directly, and we both walked out of the garden a little way, to give time for the family getting to bed; we returned in about ten minutes or a quarter of an hour, and list-



ened outside at the window to ascertain whether the family were gone to bed. All was quiet, and we then went to the boy in the privy, and took him into the house; we lighted a candle, and gave the boy some bread and cheese, and, after he had eaten, we gave him a cup full of rum, with about half a small phial of laudanum in it. (I had bought the rum the same evening at the Three Tuns, in Smithfield, and the laudanum also in small quantities at different shops.) There was no water or other liquid put in the cup with the rum and laudanum. The boy drank the contents of the cup directly in two draughts, and afterwards a little beer. In about ten minutes he fell asleep on the chair on which he sat, and I removed him from the chair to the floor, and laid him on his side. We then went out and left him there. We had a quartern of gin and a pint of beer at the Feathers, near Shoreditch Church, and then went home again, having been away from the boy about twenty minutes. We found him asleep as we had left him. We took him directly, asleep and insensible, into the garden, and tied a cord to his feet to enable us to pull him up by, and I then took him in my arms, and let him slide from them headlong into the well in the garden, whilst Williams held the cord to prevent the body going altogether too low in the well. He was nearly wholly in the water of the well, his feet just above the surface. Williams fastened the other end of the cord round the paling, to prevent the body getting beyond our reach. The boy struggled a little with his arms and legs in the water; the water bubbled for a minute. We waited

till these symptoms were past, and then went in, and afterwards I think we went out, and walked down Shoreditch to occupy the time, and in about three quarters of an hour we returned and took him out of the well, by pulling him by the cord attached to his feet; we undressed him in the paved yard, rolled his clothes up, and buried them where they were found by the witness who produced them. We carried the boy into the wash-house, laid him on the floor, and covered him over with a bag. We left him there, and went and had some coffee in Old Street Road, and then (a little before two in the morning of Friday) went back to my house. We immediately doubled the body up, and put it into a box, which we corded so that nobody might open it to see what was in it; and then went again and had some more coffee at the same place in Old Street Road, where we staid a little while, and then went home to bed—both in the same house, and to our own beds as usual; we slept till about ten o'clock on Friday morning, when we got up, took breakfast together with the family, and then went both of us to Smithfield, to the Fortune of War—we had something to eat and drink there, and after we had been there about half an hour May came in—I knew May—but had not seen him for about a fortnight before—he had some rum with me at the bar. Williams remaining in the tap-room; May and I went to the door, I had a smock-frock on, and May asked me where I had bought it, I told him “in Field Lane;” he said he wanted to buy one, and asked me to go with him; I went with him to Field Lane, where he bought a frock at the corner shop;



we then went into a clothes shop in West Street to buy a pair of breeches, but May could not agree about the price; May was rather in liquor, and sent out for some rum, which we and the woman in the shop drank together; May said he would treat her because he had given her a good deal of trouble for nothing. We then returned to the Fortune of War, and joined Williams, and had something more to drink; we waited there a short time, and then Williams and I went to the west-end of the town, leaving May at the Fortune of War. Williams and I went to Mr. Tuson's, in Windmill Street, where I saw Mr. Tuson, and offered to sell him a subject—meaning the boy we had left at home. He said he had waited so long for a subject which I had before undertaken to procure, that he had been obliged to buy one the day before. We went from there to Mr. Carpue's, in Dean Street, and offered it to him in the Lecture-room with other gentlemen; they asked me if it was fresh, I told them yes; they told me to wait. I asked them ten guineas, and, after waiting a little, a gentleman there said they would give eight guineas, which I agreed to take, and engaged to carry it there the next morning at ten o'clock. I and Williams then returned to the Fortune of War; we found May in the tap-room, this was about a quarter before four o'clock in the afternoon; we had something to drink again, and I called May out to the outside of the house, and asked what was the best price given for "things"—he said he had sold two the day before for ten guineas each, I think. I told him I had a subject, he asked what sort of one; I

said, a boy about fourteen years old, and that I had been offered eight guineas for it; he said if it was his, he would not take it, he could sell it where he sold his for more. I told him that all he could get above nine guineas he might have for himself; we agreed to go presently and get a coach. I and May then went to the bar, had something more to drink, and then, leaving Williams at the Fortune of War, we went and tried to hire a cab in the Old Bailey. The cabman was at tea at the watering-house, and we went in and spoke to him about a fare, and had also tea there ourselves. Whilst we were at tea, the cab-driver went away, and we found him gone from the stand when we came out. We then went to Bridge Street, Blackfriars, and asked a coachman if he would take such a fare as we wanted; he refused, and we then went to Farringdon-street, where we engaged a yellow chariot. I and May got in, drove to the Fortune of War (Williams joining us by the George, in the Old Bailey, on our way). At the Fortune of War, we drank something again, and then (about six o'clock) we all three went in the chariot to Nova Scotia Gardens, we went into the wash-house, where I uncorded the trunk, and shewed May the body. He asked, "how are the teeth?" I said I had not looked at them. Williams went and fetched a bradawl from the house, and May took it and forced the teeth out; it is the constant practice to take the teeth out first, because, if the body be lost, the teeth are saved; after the teeth were taken out, we put the body in a bag, and took it to the chariot; May and I carried the body, and Williams



got first into the coach, and then assisted in pulling the body in; we all then drove off to Guy's Hospital, where we saw Mr. Davis, and offered to sell the body to him; he refused, saying, that he had bought two the day before of May; I asked him to let us leave it there till the next morning; he consented, and we put it in a little room, the door of which Mr. Davis locked. Williams was, during this, left with the chariot. I told Mr. Davis not to let the subject go to any body unless I was there, for it belonged to me; and May also told him not to let it go unless he was present, or else he should be money out of pocket. I understood this to mean the money paid by May for our teas at the Old Bailey (about 4s.) and the coach fare, which we had agreed with the coachman should be 10s. May had no other interest or right to the money to be obtained for the body, except for such payment, and for what he could get above nine guineas, as I had promised him. May paid the coachman 10s. on our leaving the hospital, but, before we discharged the coach, May and I ran to Mr. Appleton, at Mr. Grainger's school, leaving Williams with the coach. We offered the subject to Mr. Appleton, but he declined to buy it, and May and I then joined Williams, discharged the coach, and went to a public-house close by and had something to drink. After this we got into a coach in the borough, and drove again to the Fortune of War, where we had something more to drink: this was about eight o'clock in the evening. We all three staid there about one hour, and then went out, got a coach in Smithfield, and went towards Old-street-road—

stopped in Golden-lane with the coach, and drank something, and then on to Old-street.—At the corner of Old-street (the Star corner) May got out of the coach and said he was going home, and I and Williams drove to the corner of Union-street, Kingsland-road, where we got out and paid the coach-fare out of money lent us by May (he having advanced to each of us 3s.) We then walked home and went to bed that night as usual. We had agreed with May, on his leaving us, to meet him at Guy's Hospital at nine o'clock the next morning (Saturday). I and Williams went at eight o'clock on Saturday morning to the Fortune of War, where we met Shields, the porter, and engaged him to go with us over the water to carry a subject. I asked him to go to St. Bartholomew's Hospital for a hamper which I had seen there; he refused, and I fetched it myself. We had a pint of beer there, and I, and Williams, and Shields, went to Guy's Hospital, Shields carrying the hamper. We met May there. Williams and Shields went to a public-house, whilst I and May went to Mr. Appleton, and offered him the subject again. He again refused to buy it, stating that he did not want it. May and I then joined Shields and Williams, and had some drink, and then left them, crossed the water in a boat to the King's College, where we inquired of Mr. Hill, the porter, if he wanted a subject; he said he was not particularly in want, but would speak to Mr. Partridge, the Demonstrator. Mr. Partridge came, and asked what the subject was. May said, "a male subject." Mr. Partridge asked the price. May said,



"twelve guineas." Mr. Partridge said he could not give so much, and went away. Mr. Hill asked us to stay a few minutes, whilst he went after Mr. Partridge, to speak to him again. Hill returned, and said Mr. Partridge would give nine guineas. May said, he would be damned if it should go under ten guineas. He was in liquor, and on his moving a little way off, I took the opportunity of saying to Hill, that it should come in at nine guineas. I told May directly after, that I had sold it for nine guineas, and that I would out of it pay him what I had of him, and give him something besides. We then got into a cabriolet, and went back to Williams and Shields at the public-house, where all four had some beefsteaks and beer; and afterwards went to Guy's Hospital, packed the body in the hamper, and put it on to Shields's head, telling him to take it to the King's College, where we went, Williams and Shields walking, and I and May riding part of the way in a cab. On reaching the King's College we carried the body into the theatre, and then into a little room, where we took the body out. Mr. Hill looked at it, and asked what it died of. May answered that he did not know, and it did not concern him. Mr. Hill asked how a cut, which was on the forehead, came. I told him that it was done by May throwing it out of the sack on the stones, which was the truth. Hill told us to remain in the other room, and he would bring in the money. We went into the other room and waited for some time, when Mr. Partridge came to us, and showed me a fifty-pound note, and said, he must go and get it changed, for he had not sufficient money with-

out, and he pulled out his purse and counted three or four sovereigns. I said he might let us have that, and he could give us the remainder on Monday. He said no, he would rather pay it all together, and went away. We waited some time, when the police-officers came, and took us into custody.

JOHN BISHOP.

Witness, R. Ellis.

I declare that this statement is all true, and that it contains all the facts as far as I can recollect. May knew nothing of the murder, and I do not believe he suspected that I had got the body except in the usual way, and after the death of it. I always told him that I got it from the ground, and he never knew to the contrary until I confessed to Mr. Williams since the trial. I have known May as a body-snatcher four or five years, but I do not believe he ever obtained a body except in the common course of men in that calling, by stealing from the graves. I also confess that I and Williams were concerned in the murder of a female whom I believe to have been since discovered to be Fanny Pigburn, on or about the 9th of October last. I and Williams saw her sitting about eleven or twelve o'clock at night on the step of a door in Shoreditch near the church. She had a child four or five years old with her on her lap. I asked why she was sitting there. She said she had no home to go to, for her landlord had turned her out into the street. I told her that she might go home with us, and sit by the fire all night; she said she would go with us, and she walked with us to my house, in Nova Scotia Gardens,



carrying her child with her. When we got there we found the family abed, and we took the woman in and lighted a fire, by which we all sat down together. I went out for beer, and we all took of beer and rum (I had brought the rum from Smithfield in my pocket); the woman and her child laid down on some dirty linen on the floor, and I and Williams went to bed. About six o'clock next morning I and Williams told her to go away, and to meet us at the London Apprentice in Old-street road, at one o'clock. This was before our families were up. She met us again at one o'clock at the London Apprentice without her child. We gave her some halfpence and beer, and desired her to meet us again at ten o'clock at night at the same place. After this we bought rum and laudanum at different places, and at ten o'clock we met the woman again at the London Apprentice, she had no child with her. We drank three pints of beer between us there, and stayed there about an hour. We would have stayed there longer, but an old man came in whom the woman said she knew, and she said she did not like him to see her there with any body; we therefore all went out; it rained hard, and we took shelter under a door-way in the Hackney-road for about half an hour. We then walked to Nova Scotia-gardens, and Williams and I led her into No. 2, an empty house adjoining my house. We had no light. Williams stepped out into the garden with the rum and laudanum, which I had handed to him; he there mixed them together in a half-pint bottle, and came into the house to me and the woman, and gave her the bottle to drink; she drank the whole at two or three draughts;

there was a quartern of rum, and about half a phial of laudanum; she sat down on the step between two rooms in the house, and went off to sleep in about ten minutes. She was falling back; I caught her to save her fall, and she laid back on the floor. Then Williams and I went to a public-house, got something to drink, and in about half an hour came back to the woman; we took her cloak off, tied a cord to her feet, carried her to a well in the garden and thrust her into it headlong; she struggled very little afterwards, and the water bubbled a little at the top. We fastened the cord to the pailings to prevent her going down beyond our reach, and left her and took a walk to Shoreditch and back, in about half an hour; we left the woman in the well for this length of time, that the rum and laudanum might run out of the body at the mouth. On our return, we took her out of the well, cut her clothes off, put them down the privy of the empty house, carried the body into the wash-house of my own house, where we doubled it up and put it into a hair box, which we corded and left it there. We did not go to bed, but went to Shields's house in Eagle-st., Red Lion-sq. and called him up; this was between four and five o'clock in the morning. We went with Shields to a public-house near the Sessions-house Clerkenwell, and had some gin, and from thence to my house, where we went in and stayed a little while, to wait the change of the police. I told Shields he was to carry that trunk to St. Thomas's Hospital. He asked if there was a woman in the house who could walk alongside of him, so that people might not take any notice. Williams called his wife up, and



asked her to walk with Shields, and to carry the hat box which he gave her to carry. There was nothing in it, but it was tied up as if there were. We then put the box with the body on Shields' head, and went to the hospital, Shields and Mrs. Williams walking on one side of the street, and I and Williams on the other. At St. Thomas's Hospital I saw Mr. South's footman, and sent him up stairs to Mr. South to ask if he wanted a subject. The footman brought me word that his master wanted one, but could not give an answer till the next day, as he had not time to look at it. During this interview, Shields, Williams, and his wife were waiting at a public-house. I then went alone to Mr. Appleton, at Mr. Grainger's, and agreed to sell it to him for eight guineas, and afterwards I fetched it from St. Thomas's Hospital, and took it to Mr. Appleton, who paid me 5*l*. then and the rest on the following Monday. After receiving the 5*l*. I went to Shields and Williams and his wife, at the public-house, where I paid Shields 10*s*. for his trouble, and we then all went to the Flower Pot in Bishopsgate, where we had something to drink and then went home. I never saw the woman's child after the first time before mentioned. She said she had left the child with a person she had taken some of her things to, before her landlord took her goods. The woman murdered did not tell us her name; she said her age was 35, I think, and that her husband, before he died, was a cabinet-maker. She was thin, rather tall, and very much marked with the small-pox. I also confess the murder of a boy who told us his name was Cunningham. It was a fortnight after the murder of the woman. I and Wil-

liams found him sleeping about eleven or twelve o'clock at night, on Friday the 21st of October, as I think, under the pig-boards in the pig-market in Smithfield. Williams woke him, and asked him to come along with him (Williams), and the boy walked with Williams and me to my house in Nova Scotia-gardens. We took him into my house, and gave him some warm beer, sweetened with sugar, with rum and laudanum in it. He drank two or three cups full, and then fell asleep in a little chair belonging to one of my children. We laid him on the floor, and went out for a little while, and got something to drink, and then returned, carried the boy to the well, and threw him into it, in the same way as we served the other boy and the woman. He died instantly in the well, and we left him there a little while, to give time for the mixtures we had given him to run out of the body. We then took the body from the well, took off the clothes in the garden, and buried them there. The body we carried into the wash-house, and put it into the same box, and left it there till the next evening, when we got a porter to carry it with us to St. Bartholomew's Hospital, where I sold it to Mr. Smith for eight guineas. This boy was about ten or eleven years old, said his mother lived in Kent-street, and that he had not been home for a twelve-month and better. I solemnly declare that these are all the murders in which I have been concerned, or that I know anything of; that I and Williams were alone concerned in these, and that no other person whatever knew any thing about either of them, and that I do not know whether there are others who practise the same



mode of obtaining bodies for sale. I know nothing of any Italian boy, and was never concerned in or knew of the murder of such a boy. There have been no white mice about my house for the last six months. My son, about eight months ago bought two mice, and I made him a cage for them; it was flat with wires at the top. They lived about two months, and were killed, I think, by a cat in the garden, where they got out of the cage. They were frequently seen running in the garden, and used to hide in a hole under the privy. I and my wife and children saw one of them killed by a cat in the garden whilst we were at tea. Until the transactions before set forth, I never was concerned in obtaining a subject by destruction of the living. I have followed the course of obtaining a livelihood as a body-snatcher for twelve years, and have obtained and sold, I think, from 500 to 1,000 bodies; but I declare, before God, that they were all obtained after death, and that, with the above exceptions, I am ignorant of any murder for that or any other purpose.\*

JOHN BISHOP.

Witness, Robert Ellis, under-sheriff.

I, Thomas Head, alias Williams, now under sentence of death in Newgate, do solemnly confess and declare the foregoing statement and confession of John Bishop, which has been made in my presence, and since read over to me distinctly, is altogether true, so far as the same relates to me. I declare that I was

never concerned in or privy to any other transaction of the like nature; that I never knew any thing of the murder of any other person whatever; that I was never a body-snatcher or concerned in the sale of any other body than the three murdered by Bishop and myself; that May was a stranger to me, and I had never seen him more than once or twice before Friday, the 4th of November last; and that May was wholly innocent and ignorant of any of those murders in which I was concerned, and for one of which I am about to suffer death.

THOMAS HEAD.

Witness—R. Ellis.

*Newgate, Dec. 4, 1831.*

The above confessions taken literally, from the prisoners, in our presence.

T. WOOD, R. ELLIS,  
Under Sheriffs.

These confessions strengthened some doubts which were entertained whether the evidence connected May sufficiently directly with the murder, and his life was spared. The communication to him of the intelligence that he had been respited, almost killed him. He fell to the earth as if shot dead. His arms worked with the most frightful contortions, and four of the officers of the prison could with difficulty hold him; his countenance assumed a livid paleness, the blood forsook his lips, his eyes appeared set, and pulsation at the heart could not be distinguished. All persons present thought that he could not possibly survive, and that the warrant of mercy had proved his death blow. It was nearly a quarter of an hour before he was restored to the use of his faculties.

---

\* From subsequent investigation, there was every reason to believe that the boy, of whose murder these wretches were convicted, was the Italian boy, and not a Lincolnshire boy.



Bishop and Williams were executed on Monday the 5th. As early as one o'clock in the morning, the crowd amounted to several thousand persons, and continued rapidly increasing. By day break it was estimated that not fewer than 30,000 persons were assembled. The police found it impossible to get through the crowd to their station at the foot of the scaffold, and had to be conducted through the prison. By some oversight, three chains were suspended from the gallows, as if all the three prisoners had been to suffer. The removal of one of them informed the multitude that May had been respited, and the circumstance was hailed with cheers.

Before proceeding to the scaffold, both prisoners confirmed their confessions. Bishop mounted the scaffold first. The moment he made his appearance the most dreadful yells and hootings were heard among the crowd. The executioner proceeded at once to the performance of his duty, and having put the rope round his neck and affixed it to the chain, placed him under the beam. Williams was then taken out, and the groans and hisses were renewed. The preparations were soon completed,

and in less than five minutes after they appeared on the scaffold, the drop fell. Bishop appeared to die instantaneously, but Williams struggled several minutes. The moment the drop fell, the mob, who had continued yelling and shouting, gave several tremendous cheers. Numerous accidents occurred between St. Sepulchre's Church and Ludgate-hill, arising from the extreme pressure of the mob. The number of dislocations and bruises, was almost incredible: upwards of twenty persons, seriously maimed, were carried to St. Bartholomew's Hospital before half-past seven in the morning. Notwithstanding the great strength of the numerous barriers which were erected from one end of the Old Bailey to the other, not one of them was sufficient to resist the pressure. Just at the moment the wretches were turned off, a rush took place from all directions towards the scaffold, and every barrier between the gallows and Ludgate-hill was almost simultaneously broken asunder, or torn up. Numbers were thus thrown down and trampled upon. A soldier in the Guards had his arm broken, and several of the police were seriously injured.



# PUBLIC DOCUMENTS.

## I.—DOMESTIC.

### ABSTRACT OF THE REFORM BILL,

*As passed in the HOUSE OF COMMONS on the 21st of September, 1831,  
but rejected by the PEERS.*

SECTION (1.) Enacted that each of the boroughs enumerated in schedule (A) shall cease hereafter to return members to parliament.

(2.) That each of the boroughs enumerated in schedule (B) shall hereafter return one member only to parliament.

(3.) that each of the principal places named in the first column of the schedule (C) shall for the purposes of this act be a borough, and shall include the several parishes, townships and places mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column, and shall hereafter return two members to parliament.

(3.) That each of the principal places named in the first column of schedule (D) shall for the purposes of this act be a borough, and shall include the several parishes, townships, and places mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column, and shall hereafter return one member to parliament.

(4.) That the towns of Weymouth and Melcombe Regis shall for the purposes of this act be taken

as one borough, and return two members.

(5.) That every city and borough named in the first column of the schedule (E) shall for the purposes of this act include the several places mentioned in conjunction therewith respectively and named in the second column, and shall, jointly with such places, hereafter return two members to parliament.

(6.) That, hereafter, each of the places named in the first column of the schedule (F) shall have a share in the election of a member of parliament, for the shire-town or borough mentioned in conjunction therewith and named in the second column: but no part of the parish of Presteigne, lying within the county of Hereford, shall for the purposes of this act be deemed to be within the town of Presteigne.

(7.) That the towns of Swansea, Lougher, Neath, Aberaven, and Ken Fig, shall for the purposes of this act be taken as one borough, and shall return one member to parliament; and the portreeve of



Swansea shall be the returning officer ; and no person by reason of any right accruing in any of the said five towns shall have any vote in the election of a member for the borough of Cardiff.

(8.) That the persons respectively described in the third column of the said schedules (C) and (D) shall be the returning officers at all elections for the boroughs in conjunction with which such persons are respectively mentioned in the said schedules (C) and (D), and for those boroughs for which no persons are mentioned the sheriff of the county in which such boroughs are situate shall, within two months after the passing of this act, and in every succeeding respective year in the month of March, by writing under his hand, appoint for each borough a fit person, resident therein, to be, and such person so appointed shall accordingly be, the returning officer for each borough, until the nomination in the succeeding March ; and in the event of the death of any such person, or of his becoming incapable to act by reason of sickness or other sufficient impediment, the sheriff shall, on notice thereof, forthwith appoint in his stead a fit person, so resident as aforesaid, to be, and such person so appointed, shall accordingly be, the returning officer for the remainder of the then current year ; and no person, having been so appointed as returning officer for any borough, shall after the expiration of his office be compellable at any time thereafter to serve again in the said office for the same borough ; but no person in holy orders, nor any churchwarden or overseer shall be appointed as such returning officer, and no person so appointed as returning officer shall be appoint-

ed a churchwarden or overseer during the year for which he shall be such returning officer ; and no person qualified to be elected to serve as member, shall be compellable to serve as returning officer, if within one week after he shall have received notice of his appointment as returning officer, he shall make oath of such qualification before any justice, and shall forthwith notify the same to the sheriff.

(9.) That in all future parliaments there shall be six knights of the shire for the county of York ; (viz.) two knights for each of the three ridings of the said county, to be elected as if each of the three ridings were a separate county.

(10.) That in all future parliaments there shall be four knights of the shire for the county of Lincoln ; (viz.) two for the parts of Lindsey, and two for the parts of Kesteven and Holland ; and such four knights shall be chosen as if the said respective parts were separate counties.

(11.) That each of the counties enumerated in schedule (G) shall be divided into two divisions and that in all future parliaments there shall be four knights of the shire for each of the said counties ; (viz.) two knights for each division of the said counties ; and such knights shall be chosen as if each of the said divisions were a separate county.

(13.) That in all future parliaments there shall be three knights of the shire for each of the following counties ; (i. e.) Berkshire, Buckinghamshire, Cambridgeshire, Dorsetshire, Herefordshire, Hertfordshire, and Oxfordshire : and two knights of the shire for each of the counties of Caermarthen, Denbigh, and Glamorgan.



(14.) That the isle of Wight in the county of Southampton, shall be a county of itself, and shall return one knight to parliament; and such knight shall be chosen as any knight may be chosen in any county in England; and all elections for the said county shall be holden at the town of Newport, and the sheriff of the isle, or deputy, shall be the returning officer.

(15.) That, for electing a knight to parliament, the east and north ridings of the county of York, the parts of Lindsey in the county of Lincoln, and the several counties in the second column of the schedule (H) shall respectively include the several cities and towns and counties of the same respectively, mentioned in conjunction with such counties at large, and named in the first column of the said schedule (H); and for the like purpose the county of Gloucester shall include that part of Bristol which is situate on the Gloucestershire side of the river Avon, and the county of Somerset shall include that part of Bristol which is situate on the Somersetshire side of the said river Avon.

(16.) Every male person of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, who shall be seised at law or in equity of any lands or tenements for an estate for life, of at least the yearly value of ten pounds above reprises, holden by copy of court roll of the lord or lady of any manor, or by any customary tenure, or lessee or assignee of any lands or tenements demised for any term not less than sixty years (whether determinable on a life or lives or not,) of the yearly value of not less than ten pounds above reprises, or demised for any term not less than twenty years

(whether determinable on a life or lives or not,) of the yearly value of not less than fifty pounds above reprises, or who shall have occupied and farmed on his own account for twelve calendar months next previous to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, any lands for which he shall be *bona fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than fifty pounds, or who shall have occupied as tenant for twelve calendar months next previous to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, any lands or tenements for which he shall be *bona fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than fifty pounds, shall vote for the county, or for the part, riding or division of the county in which such lands or tenements shall be respectively situate: but the only persons who shall vote in such election in respect of the terms of not less than sixty years or twenty years as aforesaid shall be lessees or assignees of the original term granted of the premises demised, whether or not in the occupation of the premises demised and also lessees or assignees of derivative terms or under-leases, provided such last-mentioned lessees or assignees be in the actual occupation of the premises demised.

(A.) That no person shall vote in the election of a knight in respect of any freehold lands or tenements, unless to him of the yearly value of at least ten pounds above reprises; and every person now entitled to vote in such election, in respect of his having an estate or interest in any freehold lands or tenements for the life of himself, or of any other person or persons, of the yearly value of forty shil-



lings above reprises, and below ten pounds, shall retain such right of voting so long as he shall have such estate, or interest in the same lands or tenements: and nothing shall prevent any person who now is or hereafter may be seised in fee-simple or fee-tail of any freehold lands or tenements of the yearly value of forty shillings above reprises, from voting in the election, as he might have done if this act had not been passed.

(17.) No trustee or mortgagee shall vote unless in actual possession of the rents and profits; but the mortgagor or cestuique trust in possession shall vote.

(18.) No one shall vote in the election of a knight in respect of his estate as a freeholder in any house, warehouse, or counting-house occupied by him, or in any land occupied by him, together with any house, warehouse, or counting-house, if by the occupation thereof he might vote in the election of a member for any city or borough, whether he have or not actually acquired the right to vote for such city or borough; and no person shall vote in the election of a knight in respect of his estate, as a copyholder or customary tenant, or as such lessee or assignee, or as such tenant and occupier as aforesaid, if by such occupation he or any other person might vote in the election of a member for any city or borough, whether he or any other person have actually acquired the right to vote for such city or borough or not.

(19.) Land tax no longer necessary to voting.

(20.) That no person shall vote in any election of a knight in respect of any freehold, copyhold, or customary lands or tenements, unless he shall have been seized

thereof, and have also been in the actual possession thereof, or in the receipt of the rents and profits thereof for his own use, for six calendar months at least next previous to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, and shall have been duly registered as hereinafter directed; and no person shall vote in any such election in respect of any lands or tenements held by him as such lessee or assignee as aforesaid, unless he shall have held the same as such lessee or assignee, and also have been in the actual possession thereof, or in the receipt of the rents and profits thereof for his own use, as the case may require, for twelve calendar months next previous to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, and shall have been duly registered as hereinafter directed: but where any lands or tenements which would otherwise entitle the owner or holder thereof to vote in any such election shall come to any person at any time within such respective periods of six or twelve calendar months, by descent, marriage, marriage-settlement, devise, or promotion to any benefice in a church, or by promotion to any office, he shall be entitled to have his name inserted as a voter in the election of a knight in the lists then next to be made, as hereinafter mentioned.

(21.) That in every election for any city or borough, every male person of full age, and not subject to any legal incapacity, who shall have occupied within any such city or borough, or within any place sharing in the election for such city, &c., as owner or tenant, for twelve calendar months next per-



vious to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, any house assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than ten pounds, or any house, warehouse, or counting-house being, either separately or jointly with any land owned and occupied therewith, or occupied therewith under the same landlord, of the clear yearly value of not less than ten pounds, or any house, warehouse, or counting-house, for which, whether separately or jointly with any land occupied therewith, under the same landlord, he shall be *bonâ fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than ten pounds, shall, if duly registered, as hereinafter mentioned, have a right to vote in the election of a member for such city, &c., but no person so occupying such premises, so assessed or rated as aforesaid, or of the yearly value or rent as aforesaid, shall acquire a vote unless he shall have paid, on or before the twentieth day of January, 1832, all the poor's rates and assessed taxes which shall have become payable from such person in respect of such premise previously to the eleventh day of October then next preceding or shall have paid on or before the twentieth day of August in any succeeding year all the poor's rates and assessed taxes which shall have been become payable from him in respect of such premises previously to the respective sixth day of April then next preceding, nor unless such person where his right to vote shall depend upon his being *bonâ fide* liable to a yearly rent of not less than ten pounds as aforesaid, shall in addition to the payment of the poor's rates and assessed taxes as aforesaid, have also paid on or be-

fore the said twentieth day of January, 1832, all the rent due from such person in respect of his premises so rented previously to the twenty-ninth day of September then next preceding, or shall have paid on or before the twentieth day of August in any succeeding year, all the rent which shall have become due from him in respect of such premises so rented previously to the respective twenty-fourth day of June then next preceding: but no tenant so occupying such premises at a yearly rent of not less than ten pounds, shall acquire a vote if by any agreement or contrivance or by any act of parliament, or otherwise, the landlord shall be liable to the payment of the poor's rates: but that nevertheless, where by any act of Parliament the landlord shall be liable to the payment of such rates, any such tenant may claim to be rated in respect of such premises, and upon his actually paying the full amount of the rates then due, to acquire the same right of voting as if his landlord had not been so liable for such rates: and the premises, in respect of the occupation of which any person shall be deemed entitled to vote in the election for any city or borough shall be the same premises, and not different premises respectively occupied for any portion of the said twelve months; and that where such premises as aforesaid shall be jointly occupied by more than one person as tenant or owner, each of such joint occupiers shall be entitled to vote in case the yearly value or yearly rent of such premises, or the yearly value in respect of which they shall have been assessed or rated as aforesaid, shall be of an amount which, when divided by the number of such occupiers, shall give a sum of not less



than ten pounds for each occupier, but not otherwise : and no person shall acquire a vote in the election for any city or borough who shall within twelve calendar months next previous to the first day of February, 1832, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year have been in the receipt of parochial relief.

(22.) Every person now having a right to vote for any city or borough (except those in the said schedule A) in virtue of any corporate right shall retain such right during his life, and may vote if duly registered as hereinafter mentioned ; and every burgess or freeman of any such city or borough, or person entitled to take up his freedom or to be admitted to the freedom of any such city or borough, and every son of a burgess or freeman born previously to the passing of this act, and every apprentice bound to any person in any such city or borough, previously to the passing of this act, and every person who shall hereafter marry the widow or daughter of a freeman of any such city or borough where the right of voting in the election for such city or borough is acquired by marriage, such widow or daughter having been born previously to the passing of this act, may have respectively the right of voting either as a burgess or freeman, or in the city of London as a freeman and liveryman, and shall enjoy such right during their respective lives, if duly registered ; but no person now having or hereafter acquiring such right shall be registered in the next or in any succeeding year, unless he shall, on the first of February in the next year, or on the last day of August in any succeeding year be qualified in respect of such right, in such manner as

would entitle him then to vote if such days were respectively the days of election, nor unless such person should have resided for six calendar months next previous to the first day of February in the next year, or next previous to the last day of August in any succeeding year, within the city or borough, or within the place sharing in the election for the city or borough, in respect of which city, borough, or place, such person shall respectively be entitled to vote, or within seven statute miles thereof ; and every person now having a right to vote in the election for any city or borough (except those in the said schedule A) in virtue of any qualification other than those hereinbefore reserved, shall retain such right so long only as qualified by the customs of such city or borough or any law now in force, and shall be entitled to vote if duly registered ; but no such person shall be so registered in the next or in any succeeding year, unless he shall, on the first day of February in the next year, and on the last day of August in each succeeding year, continue to be qualified in such manner as would entitle him then to vote if such days were respectively the days of election, nor unless such person, where his right to vote in the election for any such city or borough shall depend upon his estate or interest in any annuity or freehold, shall have resided six calendar months next previous to the first day of February in the next year, or next previous to the last day of August in each succeeding year, within such city or borough, or within seven statute miles thereof : but no person elected a burgess or freeman of any such city or borough since the first day of March last, otherwise



than in respect of birth, marriage or servitude, shall vote for such city or borough, or be so registered; and no person shall vote for any such city, &c., or be so registered, in respect of any estate or interest in any burgage tenement annuity or freehold which shall have been acquired since the first day of March last, unless the same shall have come to such person since that day, and previously to this act, by descent, marriage, marriage settlement, devise, or promotion to any benefice in a church, or by promotion to any office.

(23.) Nominates thirty-one commissioners, and provides that they or any sixteen shall determine in what manner each of the counties enumerated in schedule (G) shall thereafter be divided into two divisions, as hereinbefore mentioned; and the said commissioners or any sixteen shall also determine at what principal place of election the court for each division shall be holden, and at what principal place the court for the election for each of the three ridings of Yorkshire, and for the parts of Lindsey, and for the parts of Kesteven and Holland in the county of Lincoln, shall be holden; and the said commissioners or any sixteen may incorporate (for the purposes of election only) with any county, or with any division, any outlying portions of any other county locally situate within the former; and the said commissioners or any sixteen shall report in writing such their determination, and deliver such report, within three months, to one of the secretaries of state.

(24.) That the said commissioners or any sixteen may incorporate for the purposes of this act, with any city or borough, or

with any place sharing in the election for any city or borough, which shall respectively have the right of sending a member to parliament, the whole or any part of any one or more parishes, townships or other places, whether extra-parochial or otherwise, any part of which may be locally situate within one statute mile of such city, &c., respectively; and the said commissioners or any sixteen may ascertain and declare for the purposes of this act, the limits and boundaries of the several boroughs mentioned in the said schedules (C) and (D), and of such places mentioned in schedule (F) as are not now incorporated by charter, according to the true intent and meaning of the said schedules and of this act; and that so far as relates to any city, &c., which shall retain the right of sending a member to parliament, but which, in the judgment of the said commissioners, or of any sixteen, does not contain, or where any place shall share in the election then with itself and such place together, 300 houses, warehouses, or countinghouses in the whole, being respectively assessed to the duty on inhabited houses upon a yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, or respectively being, either separately, or jointly, with any land occupied therewith, of the clear yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, or rated to the relief of the poor upon a yearly value of not less than 10*l.*, or, *bonâ fide*, let at a yearly rent of not less than 10*l.*, the said commissioners, or any sixteen, shall incorporate with every such city, &c., for the purposes of this act, the whole or any part of any one or more parishes, townships, or other places, whether extra-parochial or otherwise, any



part of which may be locally situate within seven statute miles of such city, &c. ; and the said commissioners, or any sixteen, may determine what place within the limits of any borough acquiring by virtue of this act the right of sending a member to parliament, shall be the principal place for holding the election for such borough, and in case they shall not determine such principal place, then the returning officer shall ; and the said commissioners, or any sixteen, shall report in writing their determination on the several matters aforesaid, and shall deliver such report within three months after this act, to one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State.

(25.) That one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State shall forthwith cause copies of such reports to be laid before parliament, or if not sitting, then within ten days after their sitting ; and if parliament shall vote addresses to his Majesty, praying his Majesty to issue his royal proclamation for making known the reports of the said commissioners, or either of such reports, it shall be lawful for his Majesty to issue such his royal proclamation accordingly, and from the date thereof, making known the report of the said commissioners relative to counties, every county enumerated in the said schedule (G) shall, for the purposes of this act, be divided into two divisions, according to the determination of the said commissioners ; and each division shall return two knights ; and every county or division of a county shall, for the purposes of this act, include any portions of any other county incorporated therewith by the determination of the said

commissioners ; and from the date of such proclamation relative to cities and boroughs, every such city and borough as aforesaid shall, jointly with the whole or any part or parts of any parish, township or place, parishes, townships, or places, incorporated with such city or borough, or with any place sharing in the election for such city or borough, by the determination of the said commissioners, be a city or borough for the purpose of electing a member to parliament ; and the limits and boundaries of every borough mentioned in the said schedules (C) and (D), and of such places as aforesaid mentioned in the said schedule (F) shall be as declared by the said commissioners : but if either house of parliament shall, instead of voting an address to his Majesty in any of the cases hereinbefore mentioned, vote that both or either of the said reports shall be referred back to the said commissioners to be revised and amended ; in such case the said commissioners, or any sixteen, shall be required, from time to time, as such reports may be so referred back to them to revise and amend the reports so referred back, and immediately after the revision and amendment thereof, to deliver the same so revised and amended to one of his Majesty's principal Secretaries of State, who shall forthwith cause the same to be laid before parliament, or if not sitting, then within ten days after their sitting ; and if parliament shall vote an address to his Majesty, praying his Majesty to issue his royal proclamation for making known the reports so revised and amended, his Majesty may issue such his royal proclamation accordingly ; from the date of which



proclamation the divisions, incorporations, and other matters respectively determined in the report shall take effect.

(26.) That for the purpose of collecting information for enabling the said commissioners to execute their several powers, any one or more of the said commissioners is authorized to issue precepts under his hand, requiring any persons to attend before him for giving evidence, and to bring before him any books, papers or other documents of a public nature, except muniments of title.

(27.) That New Shoreham shall, for the purposes of this act, include the whole of the rape of Bramber, in the county of Sussex, except the borough and parish of Horsham; and the borough of Cricklade shall include the hundreds and divisions of Highworth, Cricklade, Staple, Kingsbridge and Malmsbury, in the county of Wilts, except the borough and parish of Malmsbury; and the borough of Aylesbury shall include the three hundreds of Aylesbury, in the county of Buckingham; and the borough of East Retford shall include the hundred of Bassetlaw, in the county of Nottingham, and all places locally situate within the outside boundary of the hundred of Bassetlaw, or surrounded by such boundary and by any part of the county of York or county of Lincoln: but every person now having a right to vote for New Shoreham, in respect of any freehold situate in the borough or parish of Horsham, and every person now having a right to vote for Cricklade, in respect of any freehold situate in the borough or parish of Malmsbury, shall respectively retain such right for the several boroughs of New

Shoreham and Cricklade including as aforesaid, subject always to the conditions hereinbefore mentioned with regard to the reservation of the right of voting for any borough in respect of freehold.

(29.) That the overseers of every parish and township shall, at the expense of such parish or township, on or before the first of February, 1832, and on or before the last of August in each succeeding year, make out, according to a prescribed and alphabetical list of all persons entitled to be registered as voters in the election for the county, for any lands, &c., situate within such parish, &c., and in such list the christian name and surname of every person shall be written at full length, together with the place of his abode, the nature of his qualification, and the name of the street, lane, or other description of the place where such lands, &c., may be situate; and the said overseers shall sign such list, and shall cause a sufficient number of copies of such list to be printed at the expense of their parish or township, and shall cause such copies to be fixed on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels within such parish or township, or if there be no such church or chapel, then in some public and conspicuous situation within the same respectively, on the two Mondays next after such list shall have been made, there to continue during the remainder of each week; and the said overseers shall likewise keep a true copy of such list, to be perused by any person, free, at all reasonable hours during the two first weeks after such list shall have been made; and the said overseers shall, on or before the twenty-fifth day of February,



1832, and on or before the twenty-fifth day of September, in each succeeding year, deliver such list to the high constable of the hundred or other like district wherein such parish or township lies, who shall forthwith deliver the same to the clerk of the peace of the county: but every precinct or place, whether extra-parochial or otherwise, which shall have no overseers, shall be deemed to be within the parish or township adjoining thereto, being situate within the same county, or the same part, riding, or division of a county, as such precinct or place; and if such precinct or place shall adjoin two or more such parishes, it shall be deemed to be within the least populous according to the last census; and the overseers of every such parish or township shall insert in the list for their respective parish or township the names of all persons entitled to be registered as voters, &c., for the county, in respect of any lands, &c., situate wholly or in part within such precinct or place.

(30.) That every person omitted in any such list, and who shall claim to have his name inserted therein, shall, on or before the last day of February, 1832, and on or before the last day of September in every succeeding year, give a notice in writing to the overseers of the parish, &c., wherein the lands, &c., may be wholly or in part situate, in respect of which he claims to have his name inserted in such list; and every person objecting to any other person as not intitled to have his name retained on any such list shall, on or before the last day of February, 1832, and on or before the last day of September in every succeeding year, give a notice

in writing to the overseers who made out such list, and shall also, on or before, &c., give to the person objected to, or leave at his usual place of abode, or send by the post directed to him at his usual place of abode, a notice in writing; and the overseers shall include the names of all persons so claiming, and so objected to, in notices prescribed, and shall cause copies to be fixed on or near the doors of all the churches and chapels within their parish or township, or if there be no such church or chapel, then in some public and conspicuous situation within the same respectively, on the Monday next preceding the tenth day of March, 1832, and on the Monday next preceding the tenth day of October in every succeeding year; and the overseers shall likewise keep a copy of the names of all the persons so claiming and so objected to, to be perused by any person, free, at all reasonable hours during the seven days next preceding the said tenth day of March in the said year, and the said tenth day of October in every succeeding year.

(31.) That the chief justice of the King's Bench, immediately after the passing of this act, and in each succeeding year, in July or August, shall appoint for Middlesex, and the judges of any of the superior courts at Westminster, named in the last commission of assize for every other county, immediately after the passing of this act, and in each succeeding year, the judges or judge of any of the said courts named in the commission of assize for every such other county, or the survivor of them, when travelling the summer circuit, shall appoint for every such county, and of Yorkshire for



each riding) subject to the approbation of the lord high chancellor), a barrister to revise the lists of voters in the election of a knight of the shire; and such barrister so appointed, shall give public notice, as well by advertisement in some of the newspapers circulating within the county or riding, as also by a notice to be fixed in some public and conspicuous situation at the principal place of election for the county or riding, or for each division of the county, that he will make a circuit of the county or riding for which he shall be so appointed, and of the several times and places at which he will hold courts for that purpose, being between the tenth day of March inclusive, and the twenty-fifth day of April inclusive, 1832, and between the tenth day of October inclusive, and the twenty-fifth day of November inclusive, in every subsequent year, and he shall hold such courts, &c.; and where two or more barristers shall be appointed for the same county or riding, they shall attend at the same places together, but shall hold separate courts at the same time: but no such barrister shall be eligible to parliament for eighteen months from his appointment for the county, &c., for which he shall be so appointed.

(32.) That the clerk of the peace and overseers shall attend before the barristers, who shall, on due proof, insert and expunge names from the county lists, and rectify mistakes therein.

(33.) That the overseers of the poor of every parish and township, &c., shall prepare lists of persons entitled to vote in cities or boroughs, in like manner as for counties as detailed in clause 29.

(34.) That for assisting the overseers in making out their lists, the town-clerk or other like officer of every city, or borough or place sharing in the election therewith, shall (upon request, during January, 1832, or during the month of August in any succeeding year, by any of the overseers within such city, &c.) deliver to such overseer an alphabetical list of all the freemen of such city, &c., entitled to vote for such city, &c., by virtue of any corporate right hereby saved, together with their respective places of abode.

(35.) That every precinct or place, whether extra parochial or otherwise, having no overseers, which now is or hereafter may be within any city, &c., shall, for the purpose of making out the list of voters, be deemed to be within the parish or township adjoining thereto; and if such precinct or place shall adjoin two or more such parishes, &c., it shall be deemed to be within the least populous, according to the last census; and the overseers of every such parish, &c., shall insert in the list the names of all persons entitled to be registered as voters for any such city or borough in respect of any property occupied by such persons within such city, &c., such property being situate wholly or in part within such precinct or place.

(36.) Persons omitted in the borough or city lists to give notice of their claims to overseers; and notices as to persons not entitled to be retained in the lists, and lists of claimants and of persons objected to, to be published, &c., as directed in counties in clause 30.

(No. 1.) That for providing a list of the liverymen entitled to vote for the city of London, the



returning officer shall, on or before the first day of February, 1832, and on or before the last day of August in each succeeding year, issue precepts to the clerks of the companies, requiring them forthwith to make out at the expense of the respective companies, an alphabetical list of the said liverymen entitled to vote; and every such clerk shall sign such list, and transmit the same, with two printed copies thereof, to such returning officer, who shall forthwith fix one such copy in the Guildhall, and one in the Royal Exchange, there to remain fourteen days; and shall cause a sufficient number of such lists to be printed at the expense of the respective companies, and shall keep the same to be perused by any person, free, during the two first weeks after such lists shall be printed; and every person omitted in any such list, and who shall claim to have his name inserted therein, shall, on or before the last day of February, 1832, and on or before the last day of September in every succeeding year, give notice in writing, to the returning officer, and to the clerk of that company, in the list whereof he shall claim to have his name inserted; and the returning officer shall include the names of all persons so claiming in a notice, and shall cause such notice to be fixed in the Guildhall and Royal Exchange on the Monday next preceding the tenth day of March, 1832, and on the Monday next preceding the tenth day of October in every succeeding year; and they shall likewise keep a copy of the names of all persons so claiming, to be perused by any person, free, during the seven days next preceding the said tenth day of

March, 1832, and the said tenth day of October in every succeeding year; and every person who shall object to any other person as not intitled to have his name retained on any such list, shall, on or before the last day of February, 1832, and on or before the last day of September in every succeeding year, give to such other person, or leave at his usual place of abode, a notice in writing; and the returning officer shall take the poll of such liverymen; and not be required to provide any such booth or compartments, but shall take one poll for all such liverymen at the same place.

(B.) Judges of Assize to name barristers to revise the lists of borough and city voters in like manner as directed for counties in clause 31.

(37.) The barrister so appointed to revise lists of borough and city voters, and, upon due proof, to insert and expunge names and rectify mistakes.

(38.) That the overseers of every parish or township shall (upon request made by them, or any of them, at any reasonable time between the first day of January and the first day of February, 1832, and between the first day of July, and the last day of August in any succeeding year, to any assessor or collector of taxes, or to any other officer having the custody of any duplicate or tax assessment for such parish or township) have free liberty to inspect any such duplicate or tax assessment, and to extract from thence necessary names; and every barrister holding any court may require any assessor, collector of taxes, or other officer having the custody of any duplicate or tax assessment, or any overseer having



the custody of any poor rate, to produce the same respectively before him.

(39.) That every barrister holding any court may adjourn the same, and from any one place to any other place within the same county or riding, or within the same city or borough, &c. but so as that no such adjourned court in the year 1832, shall be held after the 25th day of April in the said year, and that no such adjourned court in any succeeding year, shall be held after the 25th day of November in such respective year; and every such barrister may administer an oath, or affirmation, to all persons making objection to the insertion or omission of any name in such lists, and to all persons objected against, or claiming to be inserted in such lists, or claiming to have any mistake corrected, and to all witnesses; and at the holding of such respective courts the parties shall not be attended by counsel; and every such barrister shall, upon the hearing in open court, finally determine upon the validity of such claims and objections, and shall in open court write his initials against the names respectively struck out or inserted, and against any part of the said lists in which any mistakes shall have been corrected, and shall sign his name to every page.

(40.) That the lists of voters for each county, &c., so signed by any such barrister, shall be forthwith transmitted to the clerk of the peace of the county, who shall keep the said lists among the records of the sessions, arranged with every hundred, and parish, and township in alphabetical order, and shall cause the said lists to be truly copied in the same order in a

book to be by him provided at the expense of the county or riding, and shall prefix to every name its proper number, beginning the numbers from the first name and continuing them in a regular series down to the last name, and shall deliver such book on or before the last day of April, 1832, and on or before the last day of November in every succeeding year, to the sheriff or his undersheriff, who shall deliver over the same to their respective successors; and the lists of voters for each city or borough, shall be delivered to the returning officer who shall safely keep them, and cause them to be truly copied in a book provided for that purpose at the expense of the county, with every name therein numbered according to the directions aforesaid, and shall cause such book to be completed on or before the last day of April, 1832, and on or before the last day of November in every succeeding year, and shall deliver over such book, together with the lists to his successor; and such respective books to be so completed on or before the last day of April, 1832, shall be deemed the registers of electors for the several counties, parts, ridings, and divisions of counties, cities and boroughs to which such registers respectively relate, after the said last day of April in the said year, and before the first day of December in the next year; and such respective books to be so completed on or before the last day of November in such next and in every succeeding year shall be the registers of the electors to vote between the 1st day of December inclusive in the year wherein such registers shall have been made, and the 1st day of December in the following year.



(C) That the overseers of every parish and township, and the clerks of the peace for the counties, ridings, &c., shall cause to be printed, at the expense of their respective parishes, &c., and counties, &c. copies of the lists which shall be given to all persons applying, on payment of a reasonable price.

(D) That every barrister appointed to revise any lists, shall be paid at the rate of five guineas for every day above his travelling and other expenses.

(41.) That in all elections no inquiry shall be permitted at polling, as to the right of any person to vote, except only whether the person claiming to vote be the same whose name appears in such register, and whether his qualification still continues, and he has previously voted, all which inquiries the returning officer or his respective deputy shall, if required, by any candidate, make from each voter at tendering his vote, and not after, and shall also, if so required, administer an oath, or affirmation, to such voter, in the form prescribed, and no elector shall be required to take any oath or affirmation, except as aforesaid, in proof of his freehold, residence, age, or other qualification to vote; and no person claiming to vote shall be excluded from voting, except by its appearing to the returning officer or his respective deputy that the person so claiming is not the same person whose name appears in such register, or that his qualification does not still continue, or that he has previously polled, or by his refusing to take the said oath, or make the said affirmation, or to any other oath or affirmation not hereby dispensed with; and no scrutiny shall hereafter be allowed before any returning officer.

(42.) But by petition to the House of Commons, complaining of an undue election of any knight, citizen or burgess, any petitioner may question the correctness of the register, and prove that names were improperly retained, inserted, expunged or omitted in the lists from which the register shall have been constituted; and the committee may inquire into the same, and alter the poll and report the same to the House, and the return shall be amended, or the election declared void, as the case may be, and the register corrected accordingly; and in case of corruption, partiality, or wilful misconduct on the part of such barrister, may order such costs to be paid by him to the petitioner as such committee shall think reasonable: and any person whose name may have been rejected or expunged by the barrister, may, notwithstanding, tender his vote at such election, and his vote may be placed upon the poll by the committee.

(43.) That the sheriffs shall duly cause proclamation to be made of the several days fixed for the election of a knight of the shire for the several parts, ridings, and divisions of their said respective counties, and shall preside at the same by themselves or their lawful deputies.

(44.) That if on the day of election for any county, or for any part, &c., more candidates shall be proposed than the number of vacancies, and a poll shall be demanded, the polling shall commence at nine o'clock in the forenoon of the next day but one after the day fixed for the election, unless such next day but one shall be Sunday, and then on the Monday following, at the principal place of



election, and also at the several places to be appointed as hereinafter directed for taking polls; and such polling shall continue for two days only, such two days being successive days, except where Sunday shall intervene; (that is to say) for seven hours on the first day of polling, and for eight hours on the second day of polling; and no poll shall be kept open later than four o'clock in the afternoon of the second day.

(45.) That after such royal proclamation as hereinbefore mentioned shall have been issued, making known the divisions, the justices for every county at the quarter sessions next after such proclamation, or at some special sessions to be appointed by them (and of which there shall be given at least ten days' public notice), shall divide their respective counties, and parts, ridings and divisions of counties, into convenient districts for polling, and shall appoint in each district a convenient place for taking the poll, so that no person shall travel more than fifteen miles from the property in respect of which he claims to vote; but no county, or part, &c., shall have more than fifteen districts appointed for taking the poll, and the justices may appoint other districts and places for polling every two years from the respective preceding appointment; and a list of the districts and places for polling shall be lodged with the clerk of the peace of each county, who shall forthwith cause copies to be printed, at the expense of the county, and to be fixed on or near the doors of the churches and chapels within each county, or part, &c., according to the last appointment; and the polling shall take place according to the list last lodged.

(46.) That at every election for any county, or part, &c., the sheriff, under-sheriff, or sheriff's deputy shall, if required thereto on behalf of any candidate on the day fixed for the election, and if not so required may, if it shall appear to him expedient, cause to be erected a reasonable number of booths for taking the poll at each polling-place so appointed and to be affixed on the most conspicuous part of each booth the names of the several parishes, townships, and places for which such booth is respectively allotted; and no person shall vote in respect of any property situate in any parish, township or place for which any booth is allotted, except at the booth so allotted; but if any parish, township or place, shall not be included in any district the votes in respect of property situate in any parish, township or place so omitted shall be taken at the principal place of election.

(47.) That the sheriff may appoint deputies to preside and clerks to take the poll, and the poll-clerks shall, at the close of each day's poll, enclose and seal their several books, and publicly deliver them to the sheriff, under-sheriff, or sheriff's deputy, presiding at such poll, who shall give a receipt for the same, and shall on the commencement of the poll on the second day, deliver them back, so enclosed and sealed; and on the final close of the poll every such deputy, shall forthwith transmit the same so enclosed and sealed, to the sheriff or his under-sheriff, who shall keep all the poll-books unopened until the re-assembling of the court on the day next but one after the close of the poll, unless such next day but one shall be Sunday, and then on the Mon-



day following when he shall openly break the seals thereon, and cast up the number of votes as they appear on the said several books, and shall openly declare the state of the poll, and shall make proclamation of the member or members chosen not later than two o'clock in the afternoon of the said day.

(48.) That at every election for any city or borough except Monmouth, the poll shall commence on the day fixed for the election, or on the day next following, or at the latest on the third day, unless any of the said days shall be Sunday, and then on the Monday following, at the discretion of the returning officer, in case the candidates do not agree; and shall continue for two successive days, only, except where Sunday shall intervene; that is to say, for seven hours at least on the first day, and for eight hours on the second day of polling; and the poll shall on no account be kept open later than four o'clock in the afternoon of such second day, but nothing shall prevent any returning officer, or his lawful deputy, from closing the poll earlier where it might have been lawfully closed before this act.

(49.) That at every election for any city or borough except Monmouth, there shall be appointed for taking the poll different booths for different parishes, districts or parts of such city or borough, which booths may be situated either in one place or in several places, and shall be so divided into compartments as to the returning officer shall seem most convenient, so that no greater number than 600 shall be required to poll at any one compartment; and the returning officer shall appoint a clerk to take

the poll at each compartment, and shall cause to be affixed on the most conspicuous part of each of the said booths, the names of the several parishes, districts and parts for which such booth is respectively allotted; and no one shall vote except at the booth allotted for the parish, district, or part wherein the property may be situate in respect of which he claims to vote, or wherein his place of abode as described in the register may be; but no booth shall be provided for any particular parish, district or part as aforesaid, the votes in respect of property situate in any parish, district or part so omitted, may be taken at any booth; and the votes of the free-men residing out of the limits of the city or borough, but within seven statute miles thereof, may be taken at any booth; and public notice of the situation, division and allotment of the different booths shall be given three days before the commencement of the poll, by the returning officer; and in case the booths shall be situated in different places, the returning officer may appoint a deputy to preside at each place; [similar enactments to those of the 47th sec.;] but the returning officer, or his lawful deputy, may, if he think fit, declare the final state of the poll, and proceed to make the return immediately after the poll shall have been lawfully closed: and no nomination shall be made, or election holden, for any city or borough, in any church, chapel, or other place of public worship.

(50.) That all booths shall be erected at the joint and equal expense of the several candidates, and by contract with the candidates, if they will make such con-



tract, or if they shall not make such contract, then, by the sheriff or other returning officer, at the expense of the several candidates; and the deputies appointed by the sheriff or other returning officer, shall be paid each two guineas by the day, and the clerks employed in taking the poll shall be paid each one guinea by the day, at the expense of the candidates: but if any person shall be proposed without his consent, then the person proposing him shall defray his share of the said expenses as if he had been a candidate: but nothing shall prevent the candidates or any sheriff or other returning officer from hiring houses or other buildings for taking the poll, subject to the same regulations as booths.

(51.) That the sheriff or other returning officer shall, before the day fixed for the election, cause to be made for the use of each booth or other polling-place, a true copy of the register of voters, and shall under his hand certify every such copy to be true.

(52.) That every deputy of a sheriff or other returning officer may administer oaths and affirmations, and appoint commissioners as the sheriff or other returning officer, subject to the same regulations.

(53.) That every person having a right to vote for the borough of Monmouth, in respect of the towns of Newport or Usk, may give his vote at Newport or Usk respectively, before the mayor or other municipal officer; and every person having a right to vote for any shire-town or borough, in respect of any place named in the first column of schedule (F) may vote at such place before the mayor or other municipal officer; and every person having a right to vote for

the borough composed of the towns of Swansea, Lougher, Neath, Aber-aven, and Ken-fig, may vote at the town in respect of which he shall be entitled to vote; (that is to say,) at Swansea before the port-reeve of Swansea, and at each of the other towns before the mayor or other municipal officer; and at every election for Monmouth, or for any shire-town or borough named in the second column of the said schedule (F) or for the borough composed of the said five towns, the polling shall commence on the day fixed for the respective election, as well at Monmouth as at Newport and Usk respectively, and as well at the shire-town or borough as at each of the places sharing in the election therewith respectively, and as well at Swansea as at each of the four towns respectively; and shall continue for two successive days only, except intervening Sunday; that is to say, for seven hours at the least on the first day of polling, and for eight hours on the second day of polling, and shall on no account be kept open later than four o'clock in the afternoon of such second day; and the returning officer of the borough of Monmouth shall give to the mayor or other municipal officer of Newport and Usk respectively, and the returning officer of every shire-town or borough named in the second column of the said schedule (F) shall give to the mayor or other municipal officer of each of the places sharing in the election for such shire-town or borough, notice of the day fixed for such respective election, and shall before such day cause to be made, and to be delivered to every such mayor or other municipal officer, a true copy of the register of voters for the bo-



rough of Monmouth or for such shire-town or borough, and shall under his hand certify every such copy to be true; and the portreeve of the town of Swansea shall give notice of the day of election to the mayor or other municipal officer of the towns of Lougher, Neath, Aberaven and Ken-fig, and shall in like manner cause to be made, and to be delivered to every such mayor or other municipal officer, a true and certified copy of the register of voters for the borough composed of the said five towns; and the respective mayors or other municipal officers of Newport and of Usk, and of the respective places named in the first column of the said schedule (F) as well as of the towns of Lougher, Neath Aberaven, and Ken-fig, shall respectively take, manage and deliver or transmit the polls in the same manner as the deputies of the returning officers of the cities and boroughs in England.

(54.) That all laws and usages respecting elections shall remain in full force, except so far as altered or inconsistent herewith.

(56.) That if any person in the enjoyment of any office now by law disqualifying him from giving his vote shall vote, he shall be liable to all penalties to which he would have been subject at the passing of this act; and in case of a petition to the House of Commons, his vote shall be struck off by the committee, with costs.

(57.) That if any person shall personate any voter or vote twice, he shall be guilty of a misdemeanour, and be for ever disqualified from voting, and be liable to such fine, not exceeding 50*l.* or imprisonment not exceeding six months, as the court shall think fit; and in case of a petition to the House of

Commons, his vote shall be struck off by the committee, with costs.

(58.) That all writs for elections, and mandates, precepts, instruments, proceedings and notices consequent upon such writs, shall be framed conformably to this act.

(59.) Nothing shall affect the election of members for the universities of Oxford or Cambridge, or shall entitle any person to vote for the city of Oxford or town of Cambridge, in respect of the occupation of any chambers or premises in any of the colleges or halls of the universities of Oxford and Cambridge.

(60.) Misnomers shall not vitiate any proceedings under this act.

---

SCHEDULES *to which the foregoing Act refers.*

SCHEDULE (A.)

Aldeburgh, Suffolk.  
 Appleby, Westmoreland.  
 Bedwin (Great), Wilts.  
 Beeralston, Devonshire.  
 Bishop's Castle, Salop.  
 Blechingley, Surrey.  
 Boroughbridge, Yorkshire.  
 Bossiney, Cornwall.  
 Brackley, Northampton.  
 Bramber, Sussex.  
 Callington, Cornwall.  
 Camelford, ditto.  
 Castle Rising, Norfolk.  
 Corfe Castle, Dorsetshire.  
 Downton, Wilts.  
 Dunwich, Suffolk.  
 Eye, ditto.  
 Fowey, Cornwall.  
 Gatton, Surrey.  
 Haslemere, ditto.  
 Hedon, York.  
 Heytesbury, Wilts.  
 Higham Ferrers, Northampton.  
 Hindon, Wilts.  
 Ilchester, Somersetshire.



East Looe, Cornwall.  
 West Looe, ditto  
 Lostwithiel, ditto.  
 Ludgershall, Wilts.  
 Midhurst, Sussex.  
 Milborne Port, Somersetshire.  
 Minehead, ditto.  
 Newport, Cornwall.  
 Newton, Lancashire.  
 Newtown, Isle of Wight, Hants.  
 Orford, Suffolk.  
 Petersfield, Hants.  
 Plympton, Devonshire.  
 Queenborough, Kent.  
 Romney (New) ditto.  
 St. Germain's, Cornwall.  
 St. Mawe's, ditto.  
 St. Michael's or Midshall, ditto.  
 Old Sarum, Wilts.  
 Seaford, Sussex.  
 Steyning, ditto.  
 Stockbridge, Hants.  
 Tregony, Cornwall.  
 Wareham, Dorsetshire.  
 Wendover, Bucks.  
 Weobly, Herefordshire.  
 Whitechurch, Hants.  
 Winchelsea, Sussex.  
 Woodstock, Oxfordshire.  
 Wootton Bassett, Wilts.  
 Yarmouth, Isle of Wight, Hants.

## SCHEDULE (B.)

Aldborough, York.  
 Amersham, Bucks.  
 Arundel, Sussex.  
 Ashburton, Devon.  
 Bodmin, Cornwall.  
 Bridport, Dorsetshire.  
 Buckingham, Buckinghamshire.  
 Chippenham, Wiltshire.  
 Clitheroe, Lancashire.  
 Cockermouth, Cumberland.  
 Dorchester, Dorsetshire.  
 Droitwich, Worcestershire.  
 Evesham, ditto.  
 Grimsby (Great), Lincolnshire.  
 Grinstead (East), Sussex.  
 Guildford, Surrey.  
 Helston, Cornwall.

Honiton, Devonshire.  
 Huntingdon, Huntingdonshire.  
 Hythe, Kent.  
 Launceston, Cornwall.  
 Liskeard, Cornwall.  
 Lyme Regis, Dorsetshire.  
 Lymington, Hants.  
 Maldon, Essex.  
 Malmesbury, Wilts.  
 Marlborough, ditto.  
 Marlow (Great) Bucks.  
 Okehampton, Devonshire.  
 Reigate, Surrey.  
 Richmond, York.  
 Rye, Sussex.  
 St. Ives, Cornwall.  
 Saltash, ditto.  
 Shaftesbury, Dorsetshire.  
 Sudbury, Suffolk.  
 Thetford, Norfolk.  
 Thirsk, York.  
 Totness, Devonshire.  
 Wallingford, Berkshire.  
 Wilton, Wilts.

## SCHEDULE (C.)

*Principal Places to be Boroughs.*  
 Manchester, including township of Manchester, townships of Chorlton-row, Ardwick, Beswick, Hulme, Cheetham, Bradford, Newton and Harpurhey, in the hundred of Salford, Lancashire.  
 —*Returning Officer.* The boroughreeve and constables of Manchester.  
 Birmingham, including town of Birmingham, parish of Edgbaston, townships of Bordesley, Duddeston and Nechels, and Deritend, Warwickshire.—*R. O.* The two bailiffs of the town of Birmingham.  
 Leeds, including the borough and liberty of Leeds, Yorkshire.—*R. O.* The mayor of Leeds.  
 Greenwich, including the parishes of Greenwich; St. Nicholas, and St. Paul, Deptford; and Woolwich, Kent.



- Sheffield, including townships of Sheffield, Ecclesall, Brightside, Nether Hallam, Upper Hallam, and Attercliffe - cum - Darnall, Yorkshire.—*R. O.* The master cutler.
- Sunderland, including parishes of Sunderland, Bishopwearmouth, and Monkwearmouth, Durham.
- Devonport, including the town of Devonport; parish of Stoke Damerell, and township of Stonehouse, Devonshire.
- Wolverhampton, including townships of Wolverhampton, Bilston, Willenhall, Wednesfield, and parish of Sedgley, Staffordshire.—*R. O.* Constable of the manor of the deanery of Wolverhampton.
- Tower Hamlets, including the Tower division, in Ossulston Hundred, and the liberty of the Tower, Middlesex.
- Finsbury, including the Finsbury division, in Ossulston Hundred, Middlesex, and parishes or districts of St. Andrew Holborn and St. George the Martyr, Saffron Hill, Hatton Garden, Ely Rents, Ely Place, Liberty of the Rolls, St. Giles-in-the-Fields, and St. George, Bloomsbury, Middlesex.
- Mary-le-Bone, including parishes of St. Mary-le-Bone, St. Pancras, and Paddington, Middlesex.
- Lambeth, including parishes of St. Mary Lambeth, St. Mary Newington, Bermondsey, Rotherhithe, and Camberwell, Surrey.
- SCHEDULE (D.)
- Principal Places to be Boroughs.*
- Ashton - under - Lyne, including town of Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire.
- Brighthelmstone, including town of Brighthelmstone, Sussex.—*Returning Officer.* The constable of the Hundred of Whalesbone.
- Bolton-le-Moors, including townships of Great and Little Bolton, Lancashire.—*R. O.* The boroughreeves of Great and Little Bolton.
- Blackburn, including town of Blackburn, Lancashire.
- Bradford, including town of Bradford, Yorkshire.
- Bury, including town of Bury, Lancashire.
- Cheltenham, including town and parish of Cheltenham, Gloucestershire.
- Dudley, including parish of Dudley, Worcestershire.
- Frome, including town of Frome, Somersetshire.
- Gateshead, including parish of Gateshead, Durham.
- Halifax, including town of Halifax, Yorkshire.
- Huddersfield, including parish of Huddersfield, Yorkshire.
- Kidderminster, including town of Kidderminster, Worcestershire.—*R. O.* High bailiff.
- Kendal, including town of Kendal, and township of Kirkland, Westmoreland.—*R. O.* Mayor.
- Macclesfield, including town of Macclesfield, Cheshire.—*R. O.* Mayor.
- Oldham, including townships of Oldham, Chadderton, Crompton, and Royton, Lancashire.
- Rochdale, including town of Rochdale, Lancashire.
- Salford, including townships of Salford, Pendleton, and Broughton, Lancashire.—*R. O.* Boroughreeve of Salford.
- South Shields, including the town of South Shields, and township of Westoe, Durham.
- Stockport, including town of Stockport, Cheshire.—*R. O.* Mayor.



Stoke-upon-Trent, including townships of Longton and Lane End, Fenton Culvert, Fenton Vivian, Penkhull and Boothern, Shelton, Hanley, Burslem, with the Vill of Ruston Grange and the Hamlet of Sneyd, Tunstall, Chell, and Oldcott, Staffordshire.

Stroud, including the town of Stroud, parish of Minching Hampton, Gloucestershire.

Tynemouth, including township of Tynemouth, and town of North Shields, Northumberland.

Wakefield, including town of Wakefield, Yorkshire,

Walsall, including borough and foreign of Walsall, Staffordshire.

—R. O. Mayor.

Warrington, including town of Warrington, Lancashire.

Whitby, including townships of Whitby, Ruswarp, and Hawsker-cum-Stainsacre, Yorkshire.

Whitehaven, including town of Whitehaven, and town of Workington, Cumberland.

#### SCHEDULE (E.)

##### *Cities and Boroughs.*

Kingston-upon-Hull, including the parishes of the Holy Trinity and Saint Mary, and Garrison side, in the county of the town of Kingston-upon-Hull, and Sulcoates, Yorkshire.

Penryn, including the town of Falmouth, Cornwall.

Portsmouth, including the parish of Portsea, county of Southampton.

Rochester, including Chatham and Stroud, Kent.

Sandwich, including the parishes of Deal and Wallmer, Kent.

Southwark, including the parish of Christchurch and Clink Liberty, Surrey.

#### SCHEDULE (F.)

##### *Places sharing in the election of Members.*

Amlwch, Holyhead, and Llangefni, sharing with Beaumaris. (Anglesey.)

Aberystwith, Lampeter, and Adpar, sharing with Cardigan. (Cardigan.)

Llanelly, sharing with Caermarthen. (Caermarthen.)

Pwllheli, Nevin, Conway, Bangor, Cricceith, sharing with Caernarvon. (Caernarvon.)

Ruthin, Holt, town of Wrexham, sharing with Denbigh. (Denbigh.)

Rhyddlan, Overton, Caerwis, Caergwrley, St. Asaph, Holywell, Mold, sharing with Flint. (Flint.)

Llandaff, Cowbridge, Merthyr Tydvil, Aberdare, Llantrissant, sharing with Cardiff. (Glamorgan.)

Llanidloes, Welsh Pool, Machynleth, Llanfyllin, Newtown, sharing with Montgomery. (Montgomery.)

Narberth, St. David's, Fishguard, sharing with Haverfordwest. (Pembroke.)

Tenby, Weston, town of Milford, sharing with Pembroke. (Pembroke.)

Knighton, Rhayder, Kevinleece, Knucklas, town of Presteigne, sharing with Radnor. (Radnor.)

#### SCHEDULE (G.)

##### *Counties to return each Four Members.*

Chester.	Durham.
Cornwall.	Essex.
Cumberland.	Gloucester.
Derby.	Kent.
Devon.	Hampshire.



Lancaster.	Northampton.	Stafford.	Warwick.
Leicester.	Nottingham.	Suffolk.	Wilts.
Norfolk.	Salop.	Surrey.	Worcester.
Northumberland.	Somerset.	Sussex.	

---

INSTRUCTIONS and REGULATIONS regarding CHOLERA, issued under  
the authority of the PRIVY COUNCIL.

*At the Council Chamber, Whitehall, the 20th day of October, 1831, by a Committee of the Lords of His Majesty's Most Hon. Privy Council.*

Their lordships this day took into consideration certain rules and regulations proposed by the Board of Health, for the purpose of preventing the introduction and spreading of the disease called cholera morbus in the united kingdom, together with an account of the symptoms and treatment of the said disease; and were pleased to order that the same be printed and published in the Gazette, and circulated in all the principal ports, creeks, and other stations of the said united kingdom, with a view that all persons may be made acquainted therewith, and conform themselves thereto.

W. S. BATHURST.

“The measures of external precaution for preventing the introduction of the cholera morbus by a rigorous quarantine, have hitherto been found effectual, but as the disease approaches the neighbouring shores, not only is the necessity of increased vigilance more apparent, but it is also consistent with common prudence that the country should be prepared to meet the possible contingency of so dreadful a calamity. The intention of the following observations, therefore, is to submit to the public such sugges-

tions as it appears to the Board of Health should either be immediately acted upon, or so far carried into operation as that, in any case, the country should not be found uninformed as to the best means of providing for its internal protection.

“To effect the prevention of the introduction of the disorder, the most active co-operation not only of the local authorities along the coast in the measures of the government, but likewise the exercise of the utmost caution by all the inhabitants of such parts of the country, becomes indispensably necessary. The quarantine regulations established by the government are sufficient, it is confidently hoped, to prevent the disorder from being communicated through any intercourse with the continent in the regular channel of trade or passage, but they cannot guard against its introduction by means of its secret and surreptitious intercourse which is known to exist between the coast of England and the opposite shores.

“By such means this fatal disorder, in spite of all quarantine regulations, and of the utmost vigilance on the part of the government, might be introduced into the united kingdom; and it is clear that this danger can only be obviated by the most strenuous efforts on the part of all persons of any influence, to put a stop to such practices; the utmost exertions



should be used to effect this end. The magistrates, the clergy, and all persons resident on the coast, it is hoped, will endeavour to impress upon the population of their different districts (and particularly of the retired villages along the sea shore), the danger to which they expose themselves in engaging in illicit intercourse with persons coming from the continent; and should appeal to their fears in warning them of the imminent risk which they incur by holding any communication with smugglers, and others who may evade the quarantine regulations.

“To meet the other objects adverted to in the introduction,—namely, to prepare for the possible contingency of the country being visited by this disorder, as well as to assist in its prevention, it is recommended that in every town and village, commencing with those on the coast, there should be established a local Board of Health, to consist of the chief and other magistrates, the clergyman of the parish, two or more physicians or medical practitioners, and three or more of the principal inhabitants: and one of the medical members should be appointed to correspond with the Board of Health in London.

“Every large town should be divided into districts, having a district committee of two or three members, one of whom should be of the medical profession, to watch over its health, and to give the earliest information to the Board of Health in the town, whose instructions they will carry into effect.

“As the most effectual means of preventing the spreading of any pestilence has always been found to be the immediate separation of

the sick from the healthy, it is of the utmost importance that the very first cases of cholera which may appear, should be made known as early as possible; concealment of the sick would not only endanger the safety of the public, but (as success in the treatment of the cholera has been found mainly to depend on medical assistance having been given in the earliest stage of the disease) would likewise deprive the patient of his best chance of recovery.

“To carry into effect the separation of the sick from the healthy, it would be very expedient that one or more houses should be kept in view in each town or its neighbourhood, as places to which every case of the disease, as soon as detected, might be removed, provided the family of the affected person consent to such removal, and in case of refusal, a conspicuous mark (“Sick”) should be placed in front of the house, to warn persons that it is in quarantine: and even when persons with the disease shall have been removed, and the house shall have been purified, the word “Caution” should be substituted, as denoting suspicion of the disease, and the inhabitants of such house, should not be at liberty to move out or communicate with other persons until, by the authority of the local board, the mark shall have been removed.

“In some towns it may be found possible to appropriate a public hospital to this purpose, or should any barrack exist in the neighbourhood, it might, under the authority of the commander of the forces, be similarly applied.

“Wherever it may be allowed to remove the sick from their habitations to the previously selected and detached buildings, the houses from



which they have been so removed, as well as the houses in which the sick have chosen to remain, should be thoroughly purified in the following manner :—

“Decayed articles, such as rags, cordage, papers, old clothes, hangings, should be burnt; filth of every description removed, clothing and furniture should be submitted to copious effusions of water, and boiled in a strong ley; drains and privies thoroughly cleansed by streams of water and chloride of lime; ablution of wood work should be performed by a strong ley of soap and water; the walls of the house, from the cellar to the garret, should be hot lime-washed, all loose and decayed pieces of plastering should be removed.

“Free and continued admission of fresh air to all parts of the house and furniture should be enjoined for at least a week.

“It is impossible to impress too strongly the necessity of extreme cleanliness and free ventilation: they are points of the very greatest importance, whether in the houses of the sick, or generally as a measure of precaution.

“It is recommended that those who may fall victims to this formidable disease, should be buried in a detached ground in the vicinity of the house that may have been selected for the reception of cholera patients. By this regulation it is intended to confine as much as possible every source of infection to one spot; on the same principle all persons who may be employed in the removal of the sick from their own houses, as well as all those who may attend upon cholera patients in the capacity of nurses, should live apart from the rest of the community.

“It should here be observed, that the fewer the number of persons employed in these duties the better, as then the chance of spreading the infection by their means will be diminished.

“Wherever objections arise to the removal of the sick from the healthy, or other causes exist to render such a step not adviseable, the same prospect of success in extinguishing the seeds of the pestilence cannot be expected.

“Much, however, may be done even in these difficult circumstances, by following the same principles of prudence, and by avoiding all unnecessary communication with the public out of doors; all articles of food, or other necessities required by the family, should be placed in front of the house, and received by one of the inhabitants of the house, after the person delivering them shall have retired.

“Until the time during which contagion of cholera lies dormant in the human frame has been more accurately ascertained, it will be necessary, for the sake of perfect security, that convalescents from the disease, and those who have had any communication with them, should be kept under observation for a period of not less than twenty days.

“The occupiers of each house, where the disease may occur, or be supposed to have occurred, are enjoined to report the fact immediately to the local board of health in the town where they reside, in order that the professional member of such board may immediately visit, report, and, if permitted to do so, cause the patient to be removed to the place allotted for the sick,



“ In every town the name and residence of each of the members of the district committee should be fixed on the doors of the church, or other conspicuous place.

“ All intercourse with any infected town, and the neighbouring country, must be prevented by the best means within the power of the magistrates, who will have to make regulations for the supply of provisions; but such regulations are intended only for extreme cases; and the difficulty of carrying such a plan into effect on any extended scale will undoubtedly be great, but, as a precaution of great importance, it is most essential that it should be an object of consideration, in order to guard against the spreading of infection.

“ Other measures, of a more coercive nature, may be rendered expedient for the common safety, if unfortunately so fatal a disease should ever show itself in this country in the terrific way in which it has appeared in various parts of Europe, and it may become necessary to draw troops, or a strong body of police, around infected places, so as utterly to exclude the inhabitants from all intercourse with the country; and we feel sure what is demanded for the common safety of the state will always be acquiesced in with a

willing submission to the necessity which imposes it.

“ The Board particularly invites attention to a fact confirmed by all the communications received from abroad,—viz. that the poor, ill-fed, and unhealthy part of the population, and especially those who have been addicted to drinking spirituous liquors, and indulgence in irregular habits, have been the greatest sufferers from this disease, and that the infection has been most virulent, and has spread more rapidly and extensively in the districts of towns where the streets are narrow, and the population crowded, and where little or no attention has been paid to cleanliness and ventilation. They are aware of the difficulty of removing the evils referred to, but they trust that attention thus awakened will insure the most active endeavours of all magistrates, resident clergymen, and persons of influence or authority, to promote their mitigation, and as the amount of danger, and the necessity of precaution, may become more apparent, they will look with increased confidence to the individual exertions of those who may be enabled to employ them beneficially in furtherance of the suggestions above stated.”



## II.—FOREIGN.

## DOCUMENTS connected with the SEPARATION of BELGIUM from HOLLAND.

PROTOCOL of the CONFERENCE of LONDON, 20th of December, 1830, and accompanying NOTES.

*Protocol of the Conference at the Foreign-office, December 20, 1830; present, the Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia.*

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts having received the formal assent of the Belgic government to the armistice which had been proposed to it, and which the king of the Netherlands has also accepted, and the Congress of ministers having thus, by the stopping of the effusion of blood, accomplished the first part of the task which it had undertaken, the plenipotentiaries have met to deliberate on the further measures to be taken with a view to remedy the derangements which the troubles that have taken place in Belgium have caused in the system established by the treaties of 1814 and 1815.

“In forming, by the treaties in question, the union of Belgium with Holland, the Powers who signed those treaties, and whose plenipotentiaries are at this moment assembled, had in view to found a just equilibrium in Europe, and to secure the maintenance of general peace.

“The events of the last four months have unhappily demonstrated, that “the perfect and complete amalgamation which the Powers desire to effect between

these two countries” had not been obtained; that it would, henceforth, be impossible to effect it; that, therefore, the very object of the union of Belgium with Holland is destroyed; and that it now becomes indispensable to have recourse to other arrangements to accomplish the intentions which the union in question was designed to carry into execution.

“United to Holland, and forming an integral part of the kingdom of the Netherlands, Belgium had to fulfil its part of the European duties of that kingdom, and of the obligations which the treaties had caused it to contract towards the other Powers. Its separation from Holland cannot liberate it from that part of its duties and obligations.

“The Congress will consequently proceed to discuss and to concert new arrangements, most calculated to combine the future independence of Belgium with the stipulations of the treaties, with the interests and the security of the other Powers, and with the preservation of the balance of Europe. With this view the Congress, while continuing its negotiations with the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, will invite the provisional government of Belgium to send to London, as soon as possible, commissioners provided with instructions and sufficient powers to be consulted and heard respecting every thing which may facili-



tate the definitive adoption of the arrangements above alluded to.

“These arrangements cannot affect, in any manner, the rights which the king of the Netherlands and the German Confederation exercise over the Grand Duchy of Luxemburg.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five great Powers have agreed that the present protocol should be communicated to his majesty the king of the Netherlands, and a copy sent to lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson, with the annexed letter, which they will communicate to the Provisional Government of Belgium.”

(Signed as before.)

*Letter addressed to Lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson, accompanying the Protocol of December 20.*

“London, December 20.

“Gentlemen. — We have the honour to send you to-day a protocol, relative to an important resolution taken to-day, in the name of the five allied Powers. It is our intention, that this document should be laid before the provisional government, and that you should urge the speedy sending of the commissioners, with whom we wish to confer. This measure, and the decision which supports it, will give you a double right to direct the attention of the government of Belgium to another point of our protocol, which relates to the grand duchy of Luxemburg.

“By the note, of which a copy is enclosed, the German Confederation invited the Congress at London to examine, whether it did not possess the means to avoid, either wholly or in part, a more positive interference, on the part of the Confederation, in the grand duchy of Luxemburg. The rights of the

German Confederation, with respect to that country, have already been recognised, in a protocol of the Congress, dated the 17th of November.

“We, therefore, desire you to claim of the Provisional Belgic Government, offering, at the same time, your good offices, the immediate and formal cessation, on its part of all interference in the affairs of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, and you will invite that government to issue all the necessary proclamations to make its resolution known to the inhabitants of the grand duchy.

“Accept, &c.

(Signed) “ESTERHAZY.

“WESSENBERG.

“TALLEYRAND.

“PALMERSTON.

“LIEVEN.

“MATUSCEWITSCH.”

*Note, addressed to the Plenipotentiaries of Austria and Prussia to the Congress of London :—*

“The undersigned plenipotentiaries of Austria and Prussia are commissioned by the German Confederation to make the following communication to the Congress :—

“His majesty the king of the Netherlands, in his character of grand duke of Luxemburg, claimed from the Confederation the necessary assistance to quell the insurrection that had broken out in the Grand Duchy. This claim was necessarily attended to by the Confederation. Considering, however, that the insurrection in the Grand Duchy is merely a consequence of that which had broken out in Belgium, and that the latter is at this moment the subject of the Conference of the plenipotentiaries of the five great Powers assembled in London, the Confederation has



judged that before taking the measures which it is competent to adopt, it should apply to the Congress to assure itself whether the Congress had found, or was endeavouring to find, suitable means to attain the end proposed, and to render a more decided intervention of the German Confederation, wholly or in part, unnecessary. The undersigned, in executing this commission, request the Congress to enable them to send to the Confederation the information desired.

“ESTERHAZY.

“WESSENBERG.

“BULOW.”

*Verbal Note of December 31.*

“Lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson have the honour to communicate to the president and members of the Diplomatic Committee attested copies of the protocol of a Conference held at London on the 20th instant, by their excellencies the plenipotentiaries of the five great Powers, and of a letter accompanying it.

“Lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson request the president of the Diplomatic Committee to inform them whether the Belgian commissioners sent to London are furnished with powers sufficiently ample to treat on the various points enumerated in the protocol. If these powers should not be sufficient, the Provisional Government of Belgium will be sensible of the necessity of immediately sending them fuller powers.

“Lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson take this opportunity to repeat to the president of the Diplomatic Committee the assurance that their excellencies the plenipotentiaries have spared no pains to convince the Cabinet of the Hague that the measures of precaution

which still impede the navigation of the Scheldt ought to be revoked as soon as possible. On the 27th instant, their excellencies resolved again to call upon the government of his majesty king William to put an end to hostilities, to every act that might be considered as hostile, and their excellencies the ambassadors and ministers of the five courts at the Hague have received from their excellencies the plenipotentiaries the invitation to urge his majesty to comply as soon as possible with the wishes which they formally repeat.

“The Provisional Government cannot fail duly to appreciate the readiness of their excellencies the plenipotentiaries to attend to the claims which it has made, and it will doubtless wait with confidence till the steps which the five Powers will find means to render effectual shall have led to the result which Belgium hopes.

“On this occasion lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson think it their duty to observe, that the protocol of the 17th of December not having been accepted by the Provisional Government till the 25th instant, not a moment has been lost by their excellencies in taking the decisive measures which they have adopted.

“The uneasiness and eager desires manifested by the country are doubtless very natural in the distressed state in which it is; but it is impossible not to allow for the distances of place and time, and not to perceive that affairs of such importance cannot be treated with precipitation.”

*Verbal Note of January 3, 1831.*

“The president and members of the Diplomatic Committee having had the honour to receive from



lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson, by a verbal note of December 31, attested copies of the protocol of a Conference held at London on the 20th of December by the plenipotentiaries of the five Powers, hasten to return the following answer :

“It appears to them that the raising of the blockade and the free navigation of the Scheldt, being the principal conditions of the armistice, and even of the suspension of arms, executed already on the 21st of November, the first task undertaken by the five great Powers was not yet accomplished.

“The balance of Europe may still be secured, and general peace maintained, by rendering Belgium independent, strong, and happy. If Belgium were without strength and without happiness, the new arrangement would be threatened with the fate of the political combination of 1815.

“Independent Belgium has doubtless to perform its part of the duties towards Europe, but it will be difficult to conceive what obligations can be imposed on it by treaties in which it took no part.

“The commissioners sent to London are provided with sufficient instructions to be heard on all the affairs of Belgium, and they cannot conceal from the congress of ministers that, in the critical circumstances in which the Belgic nation is placed, it will doubtless appear impossible for Belgium to form an independent state without an immediate guarantee of the freedom of the Scheldt, of the possession of the left bank of that river, of the whole of the province of Limburg and of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, reserving its relations with the Germanic Confederation.

“Their excellencies the pleni-

potentiaries of the five great Powers will easily conceive, from the reports made to them by lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson, the critical situation of the country, and the impossibility of prolonging this state of uncertainty.”

After the reading of this communication, a debate arose, in which the choice of a sovereign was again mentioned, and at the conclusion, M. C. Rodenbach laid on the table a proposal to the effect that the sections should immediately take into consideration what relates to the choice of the head of the state. The congress decided that this proposal should be sent to the sections for examination.

---

#### PROTOCOL of JANUARY 9, 1831.

Present:—The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have assembled for the purpose of examining the remonstrances which the Court of London has received on the part of the Provisional Government of Belgium against the continuance of the measures which still paralyse the navigation of the Scheldt, and on the part of his majesty the king of the Netherlands against the acts of hostility committed by the Belgian troops.

“Considering that the protocol No. 1. of November, 1830, contains the following — ‘On both sides hostilities shall cease entirely :’

“Considering that by the document annexed under the letter B. to the protocol of No. 2, ‘the Provisional Government of Belgium has pledged itself to give orders, and to take the necessary measures for all hostilities to cease



against Holland on the part of the Belgians :

“Considering further, that by the document annexed under the letter A. to the protocol No. 3, dated November 17, 1830, his majesty the king of the Netherlands has declared, ‘that he accepts the proposition above mentioned (that relative to the entire cessation of hostilities on both sides), after the tenor of the protocol No. 1. of the Conference :’

“Considering that the protocol, No. 2, of November 17th, states, that, ‘the armistice having been agreed upon by both parties, it constitutes an engagement entered into with the five Powers, and that, on both sides, they shall retain the power of communicating freely, by land and sea, with the territories, places, and points, occupied by the respective troops, beyond the limits which separated Belgium from the United Provinces of the Netherlands, before the Treaty of Paris of May 30, 1814 :’

“Considering also, that, by the protocol No. 3, of November 17th, the Powers have regarded the armistice contracted, as an engagement entered into with them, the execution of which it is their duty to look to in future :

“Considering that, in the subsequent protocol, No. 4, of November 30, the plenipotentiary of his majesty the king of the Netherlands informed those of the five Powers of the entire concurrence of the king his master in their protocols of November 17, 1830 :

“That, consequently, it was understood that the hostilities in question should cease entirely by land and sea, and that they should not be resumed in any case, the armistice having been declared in-

definite by the protocols of November 17, and the cessation of hostilities having been placed under the immediate guarantee of the five Powers, by the protocols, No. 4, of November 30, and No. 5, of December 10, 1830 :

“That the nature and value of these engagements were explained to the Provisional Government of Belgium, as early as the 6th of December, by a verbal note of lord Ponsonby and M. Bresson, in consequence of which the Provisional Government of Belgium declared, that it agreed to the protocol of November 17 :

“Considering, lastly, that on the faith of this assent, a common application of the five Powers was made to his majesty the king of the Netherlands, with the view of obtaining the complete revocation of the measures which still impede the navigation of the Scheldt, the plenipotentiaries were unanimously of opinion, that it was the duty of the five Powers to insist on the faithful, prompt, and entire execution of the engagements, which they declare to have been taken towards themselves.

“In consequence, the plenipotentiaries have resolved to signify to the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, that the five Powers, having taken under their guarantee the cessation of hostilities, cannot allow on the part of his majesty, the continuation of any measure bearing a hostile character, and that, such being the character of those measures which hinder the navigation of the Scheldt, the five Powers are obliged to require, for the last time, the revocation of them.

“The plenipotentiaries have already observed, that this revocation should be entire, and restore



the free navigation of the Scheldt, without any other duties than those which were established in 1814, before the union of Belgium and Holland in favour of neutral vessels, and of those belonging to the Belgic port; his majesty the king of the Netherlands having declared, through his plenipotentiary, that vessels belonging to the Belgic ports had not been and would not be molested, so long as the Belgians did not molest the vessels and property of the northern provinces of the Netherlands:

“Convinced, that in his probity and wisdom, the king will not fail to accede to all the points of their demand, the plenipotentiaries are nevertheless forced to declare here, that the rejection of the demand would be considered by the five Powers as an act of hostility against them, and that if on the 20th of January, the measures which hinder the navigation of the Scheldt, do not cease in the time above mentioned, and conformably to the promises of his majesty himself, the five Powers reserve to themselves the right of adopting such resolutions which they should find necessary for the prompt execution of their engagements.

“With a just regard to reciprocity, the plenipotentiaries having been informed that a recommencement of hostilities has taken place, principally between the environs of Maestricht, that movements of the Belgic troops seem to announce their intention of investing that place, and that the troops have quitted the positions which they ought to have retained till the final determination of the line, by virtue of the annexed declaration of the Provisional Government of Belgium of the 21st of November, 1830, have resolved

to authorise their commissioners at Brussels to inform the Provisional Government of Belgium, that the acts of hostility above mentioned must cease without the least delay, and that the Belgic troops must return immediately, according to the above mentioned declaration, to the position which they occupied on the 21st of November, 1830.

“The commissioners will add, that if the Belgic troops should not have returned to those positions by the 20th of January, the five Powers will consider the rejection of their demand in this respect as an act of hostility against themselves, and would reserve to themselves the right of adopting such measures as they should judge necessary to cause the engagements entered into with them to be respected and executed.

“The plenipotentiaries, moreover, renew, in the present protocol, the formal declaration, that the entire and reciprocal cessation of hostilities is placed under the guarantee of the five Powers, that they will not allow the renewal of them on any supposition, and that they have formed the unchangeable resolution to obtain the accomplishment of their decisions, founded upon justice, and their wish to preserve to Europe the blessings of a general peace.

(Signed) “ESTERHAZY.

“TALLEYRAND.

“BULOW.

“WESSENBERG.

“PALMERSTON.

“LIEVEN.

“MATUSCEWITSCH.”

“A true copy,

(Signed) “PONSONBY.

“BRESSON.

“A true copy,

“The Vice-President,

“Count d'AERSCHOT.”



EXTRACT of the PROTOCOL of the CONFERENCE held at the FOREIGN OFFICE, JANUARY 20, 1831; present, the PLENIPOTENTIARIES of AUSTRIA, FRANCE, GREAT BRITAIN, PRUSSIA, AND RUSSIA.

“The plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia, have taken cognizance of the subjoined letter addressed to their commissioners at Brussels, in the name of the Provisional Government of Belgium, which imports that, conformably to the tenor of the protocol of January 9, 1831, the Belgian troops which had advanced to the environs of Maestricht had received orders to retire immediately, and to avoid any cause for hostility.

“Having had reason to be convinced, through the explanations of their commissioners, that this retreat of the Belgian troops will have the effect of securing to Maestricht that entire freedom of communication which it ought to enjoy, they cannot doubt that, on his side, his majesty the king of the Netherlands has provided for the fulfilment of the protocol of the 9th of January, he having, besides, issued the necessary orders with reference to the cases provided for by the protocol; and they being now convinced of the complete establishment of the cessation of hostilities, of which they were desirous, the Powers have proceeded to the examination of the question which they had determined to resolve, in order to realize the object of their protocol of the 20th of December, 1831, in order to make a useful application of the fundamental principles which, by that act, are connected

with the future independence of Belgium, and to maintain, also, the general peace, the maintenance of which constitutes the chief interest, as it is the chief desire of the Powers assembled in Conference at London.

“With this object in view, the Powers have considered it indispensable to consider all the bases with reference to the limits which ought henceforth to separate the Dutch from the Belgian territory.

“With regard to this object, propositions have been transmitted to them from both parties. After having maturely considered them, they have agreed among themselves upon the following bases:—

“Art. 1. The limits of Holland shall comprise all the territories, districts, towns, and places which belonged to the ci-devant republic of the United Provinces of the Netherlands in the year 1790.

“2. Belgium shall consist of all the territories which receive the denomination of the kingdom of the Netherlands in the treaty of 1815, except the grand Duchy of Luxemburg, which, possessed under a different title, by the Princes of the house of Nassau, forms part, and will continue to form part, of the Germanic Confederation.

“3. It is understood that the arrangements of the articles from 108 to 117 inclusive, of the general act of the Congress of Vienna, relative to the free navigation of the rivers and navigable streams, shall be applied to the rivers and streams which traverse the Dutch and Belgian territories.

“4. As it will, nevertheless, result from the bases laid down in articles 1 and 2, that Holland and Belgium will possess detached portions of land within their respect-



ive territories, such exchanges and arrangements shall, through the care of the five Courts be effected between the two countries, as shall ensure to them, reciprocally, the advantage of an entire contiguity of possession, and of a free communication between the towns and rivers included in their frontiers.

“These preceding articles being agreed upon, the Powers have devoted their attention to the means of consolidating the work of peace, respecting which the five Powers are most solicitous, and placing in their true light the principles which actuate their common policy.

“They are unanimously of opinion that the five Powers owe to their interest, well understood—to their union, to the tranquillity of Europe, and to the accomplishment of their views contained in the protocol of the 20th of December, a solemn manifestation, a striking proof of their firm determination not to seek in the arrangements relative to Belgium, under whatever circumstances they may present themselves, any augmentation of territory—any exclusive influence—any isolated advantages but to give to that country itself, as well as to all the states which adjoin it, the best guarantees of repose and security. It is in pursuance of these maxims and with these salutary intentions, that the Powers have resolved to add to the preceding articles those which follow:

“Art. 5. Belgium, within those limits that shall be determined, and traced, conformably to the arrangements laid down in articles 1, 2, and 4, of the present protocol, shall form a state, perpetually neutral, the five Powers guaranteeing to it that perpetual neu-

trality, as well as the integrity and inviolability of its territory, within the limits mentioned above.

“6. By a just reciprocity Belgium will be bound to observe the same neutrality towards all the other states, and not to make any attempt against their internal or external tranquillity.

(Conformable to copy.)

“PONSONBY.”

---

PROTOCOL of LONDON of the 19th of FEBRUARY :—

Present:—The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.

“The plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia having assembled, directed their whole attention to the divers interpretations given to the protocol of the Conference of London, of December 20, 1830; and to the principal acts that have followed it. The deliberations of the plenipotentiaries led them to admit unanimously that they owe it to the position of the five Courts, as well as to the cause of general peace, which is their own cause, and that of European civilization, to repeat here the grand principle of right, of which the acts of the Conference of London have only presented a salutary and constant application.

“According to this principle of a superior order, treaties do not lose their force, whatever changes may take place in the internal organization of nations. To judge of the application which the five Courts have made of this same principle, and appreciate the determinations they have formed with regard to Belgium, it suffices to go back to the year 1814.



“At that period the Belgian provinces were occupied by the military forces of Austria, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia; and the rights which these powers exercised over them were completed by France’s renunciation of the possession of the same provinces. But France’s renunciation was not made in favour of the occupying powers. It proceeded from an idea of a more elevated order. The Powers, and France herself, equally disinterested then, as at present, in their views upon Belgium, kept the disposal, but not the sovereignty of it, with the sole intention of making the Belgian provinces contribute to the establishment of a just balance of power in Europe, and the maintenance of the general peace. It was this intention that guided their ulterior stipulations, and united Belgium to Holland; it was this that led the Powers to secure from that moment to the Belgians the twofold blessing of free institutions, and a commerce to them abounding in wealth and the development of industry.

“The union of Belgium with Holland was broken. Official communications are long convinced the five Courts that the means primarily destined to maintain it, could neither restore it for the present, nor maintain it subsequently, and that henceforth, instead of confounding the affections and happiness of two nations, it only brought in contact passions and hatred, and from their shock nothing proceeded but war, with all its disasters. It did not belong to the powers to judge of the causes which had just severed the ties which they had formed. But when they beheld these ties broken, it belonged to them again to accomplish the ob-

VOL. LXXIII.

ject which they proposed to themselves in forming them. It belonged to them to secure, by means of new combinations, that tranquillity of Europe, of which the union of Belgium with Holland had constituted one of the bases. To this the Powers were imperiously called. They had the right, and events rendered it their duty, to prevent the Belgian provinces, become independent, disturbing the general security and the balance of power in Europe.

“Such a duty rendered all foreign concurrence useless. To act together, the Powers had only to consult their treaties, and measure the extent of the dangers to which their inaction, or their want of accord might give rise. The steps taken by the five Courts with a view to bring about a cessation of the struggle between Belgium and Holland, and their firm resolution to put an end to every measure which, on the one side or the other, might have had a hostile character, were the first consequences of the identity of their opinions upon the value and principles of the solemn transactions which bind them.

“The effusion of blood was stopped. Holland, Belgium, and even the neighbouring states, are equally indebted to them for this benefit.

“The second application of the same principles took place in the protocol of December 20, 1830.

“To this exposition of the motives which determined the five Courts, this act associated the reserve of the duties with which Belgium remained charged towards Europe, upon seeing her wishes for separation and independence accomplished.

“Each nation has its particular rights; but Europe has also her



right ; it is social order that has given it to her.

“ Belgium, upon becoming independent, found the treaties which governed Europe made and in vigour.

“ She was bound, then, to respect them and could not infringe them. By respecting them, she conformed to the interest and repose of the great community of European states ; by infringing them she would have brought on confusion and war. The Powers alone could prevent this, and as they could do it, it was their duty to do so ; it was their duty to give ascendancy to the salutary maxim, that the events which gave birth to a new state in Europe, give it no more right to alter the general system into which it enters, than the changes that may have arisen in the condition of an ancient state authorized to believe itself absolved from its anterior engagements—a maxim of all civilized nations, a maxim which is connected with the very principle by which states survive their governments, and the imprescriptable obligations of treaties upon those who contract them—a maxim, in short, which is never overlooked without making civilization retrograde, of which morality and public faith are happily the first consequences and the first guarantees.

“ The protocol of December 20th fully expressed these truths. It stated distinctly “ that the Conference would occupy itself in discussing and concerting such new arrangements as were best calculated to reconcile the future independence of Belgium with the stipulations of treaties, with the interests and safety of other states, and with the preservation of the balance of power in Europe.” Thus did the

Powers point out the objects they wished to attain. They proceeded towards them strong in the purity of their intentions and in their impartiality. While, on the one hand, by their protocol of January 18, they repelled the pretensions that could never be admissible, on the other hand, they weighed with the most scrupulous care all the opinions that had been uttered by both parties, and all the claims that each had set up. From a profound and mature consideration of the various communications made by the plenipotentiaries of the King of the Netherlands, and by the commissioners from Belgium, resulted the definitive protocol of January 20, 1831.

“ It is to be foreseen that the first ardour of a nascent and growing independence would tend to transgress the bounds of those obligations from which it was derived. The five Courts, however, could not admit a right in Belgium to make conquests from Holland or from other states. But, compelled to settle questions of territory essentially connected with their own conventions and their own interests, the five Powers did not insist with regard to Belgium upon any maxims that they did not hold as rigorous laws for their own conduct. They most assuredly did not pass the limits of justice and equity, nor the rules of sound policy, when, by adopting impartially the limits which separated Belgium from Holland before their union, they refused to the Belgians the right of invading that power they had rejected, because they considered it as subversive of peace and social order.

“ The Powers had also to deliberate upon other questions which



were connected with their treaties, and which, consequently, could not be subjected to new decisions without their direct concurrence.

“According to the protocol of Dec. 20, the instructions and full powers required to be granted to the Belgian commissioners that were to be sent to London, were, that they should embrace all the objects of the negotiation. Nevertheless, these commissioners arrived without sufficient powers, and, on many important points, without information, and yet circumstances admitted of no delay.

“The Powers, notwithstanding, by the protocol of January 27, confined themselves on the one hand to enumerating the charges inherent either in the Belgian or in the Dutch territory, and, on the other, limited themselves to proposing arrangements founded upon a reciprocity of concessions, preserving to the Belgians those markets which had most contributed to their wealth, and founded upon the notoriety of the public budgets of the kingdom of the Netherlands.

“In these arrangements the five Powers must necessarily act as mediators, for without that, the interested parties could not come to an understanding, nor could the stipulations in which these Powers took an immediate part in 1814 and 1815, be modified.

“The assent of the King of the Netherlands to the protocols of Jan. 20 and 27, 1831, answered the cares of the parties to the Conference at London. The new mode of existence attained by Belgium, and its neutrality, thus received a sanction which could not be dispensed with. It remained only for the Conference to come to

resolutions upon the protest made by Belgium against the first of these protocols, a subject the more important as it is fundamental.

“This protest claimed a right of post-limits, which belongs only to independent states, and which cannot, consequently, belong to Belgium, since she has never been reckoned among those states. This protest mentions also cessions made to a third Power, and not to Belgium, who never has been in possession of them, and, therefore, cannot insist upon them.

“The nullity of such pretensions is evident. Far from making any attack upon the ancient provinces of Belgium, the Powers have only declared and maintained the integrity of neighbouring states. Instead, indeed, of compressing the limits of these provinces, they have comprised in them the principality of Liege, which had at no former period made part of them.

“Moreover, all that Belgium could require she has obtained—separation from Holland—independence—external safety—guarantees of her territory, and neutrality—the free navigation of the rivers that serve as the channels of her commerce—and peaceable enjoyment of her national liberties.

“Such are the arrangements opposed by the protest in question, publicly avowing to respect neither the possessions nor the rights of adjoining states.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts, considering that such views are views of conquest, incompatible with existing treaties, with the peace of Europe, and consequently with the independence and neutrality of Belgium, declare ;—

“1. That it remains understood, as it has been from the beginning,



that the arrangements resolved on by the protocol of Jan. 20, 1831, are fundamental and irrevocable arrangements.

“2. That the independence of Belgium shall only be recognized by the five Powers, upon the conditions and in the limits which result from the said arrangements of Jan. 20, 1831.

“3. That the principle of the neutrality and the inviolability of the Belgian territory in the above-mentioned limits remains in vigour and obligatory upon the five Powers.

“4. That the five Powers, faithful to their engagements, claim the full right of declaring that the sovereign of Belgium must answer by his personal situation to the principle even of the existence of Belgium; satisfy the security of the other states, accept without restriction as his majesty the king of the Netherlands has done for the protocol of July 21, 1814, all the fundamental arrangements contained in the protocol of Jan. 20, 1831, and have it in his power to secure to the Belgians the peaceable enjoyment thereof.

“5. That these first conditions being fulfilled, the five Powers will continue to employ their care and their good offices to lead to the reciprocal adoption and execution of the other arrangements rendered necessary by the separation of Belgium from Holland.

“6. That the five Powers admit the right in virtue of which the other states may take such measures as they may judge necessary to enforce respect to or to re-establish their legitimate authority in all the countries belonging to them, to which the protest mentioned above sets up pretensions,

and which are situated out of the Belgian territory declared neutral.

“7. That his majesty the king of the Netherlands having acceded without restriction, by the protocol of Feb. 18, 1831, to the arrangements relative to the separation of Belgium from Holland, every enterprize of the Belgian authorities upon the territory which the protocol of January 20 has declared Dutch, will be regarded as a renewal of the struggle to which the five Powers have resolved to put an end.

---

PROTOCOL of a CONFERENCE  
held at the FOREIGN OFFICE  
APRIL 17, 1831, between the  
PLENIPOTENTIARIES of AUSTRIA,  
GREAT BRITAIN, PRUSSIA,  
and RUSSIA, relative to the  
DEMOLITION of the FORTRESSES.

“The plenipotentiaries of Austria, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia, having met, have directed their attention to the fortresses constructed since the year 1815, in the kingdom of the Netherlands, at the expense of the four Courts; and to the determinations which it would become necessary to take with respect to these fortresses, when the separation of Belgium from Holland shall have been definitively effected.

“Having carefully examined this question, the plenipotentiaries of the four Courts were unanimously of opinion,—that the new situation in which Belgium would be placed, with her neutrality acknowledged and guaranteed by France, ought to change the system of military defence which had



been adopted for the kingdom of the Netherlands ; that the fortresses in question would be too numerous not to make it difficult for the Belgians to provide for their maintenance and defence : that, moreover, the unanimously admitted inviolability of the Belgian territory offered a security which did not previously exist ; finally, that a part of these fortresses, constructed under different circumstances, might at present be razed.

“In consequence, the plenipotentiaries have finally decided, that as soon as a government shall exist in Belgium, recognized by the Powers taking part in the Conferences of London, a negotiation shall be set on foot between the four Powers and that government, for the purpose of selecting such of the said fortresses as should be demolished.

(Signed) “ESTERHAZY.  
 “WESSENBERG.  
 “PALMERSTON.  
 “BULOW.  
 “LIEVEN.  
 “MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

NOTE ADDRESSED *by the* PLENIPOTENTIARIES of AUSTRIA, GREAT BRITAIN, PRUSSIA, and RUSSIA, *to the* PLENIPOTENTIARY of FRANCE.

“*Foreign Office, July 14, 1831.*

“The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia, being desirous to give a further proof of the reliance which they place on the disposition shown by the government of his majesty the king of the French for the maintenance of the general peace, think it their duty to communicate

to the Prince de Talleyrand the annexed copy of a Protocol which they have issued upon the subject of the fortresses erected since the year 1815, in the kingdom of the Netherlands.

“The undersigned see no objection to giving the same publicity to this Protocol as may be given to the other acts of the negotiations which have taken place since the month of November, 1830, on the affairs of Belgium.

“They take this opportunity to renew, &c.

(Signed) “ESTERHAZY.  
 “PALMERSTON.  
 “BULOW.  
 “LIEVEN.  
 “MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

PROTOCOL of the CONFERENCE held on the 17th of APRIL, 1831, at the FOREIGN OFFICE, LONDON, containing the Adhesion of FRANCE, to that of the 20th of JANUARY.

“Present, the plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia. Upon the opening of the Conference the plenipotentiary of France declared by the express command of his sovereign, that France acceded to the protocol of January 20, 1831 ; that she approved of the boundaries fixed in that act for Belgium ; that she recognized the neutrality as well as the inviolability of the Belgian territory ; that she would acknowledge the sovereign of Belgium only when that sovereign should have acceded to all the provisions and clauses of the protocol of January 20, 1831 ; and that, according to the principles laid down in that protocol, the French government considered the grand duchy of Luxemburg as completely



separated from Belgium, so that the said grand duchy should continue under the sovereignty and in the relations which were assigned to it by the treaties of 1815. To this declaration the French plenipotentiary added several observations on the nature of the exchanges of territory, which, in conformity with article 4 of the protocol of the 20th of January, are to be effected under the mediation of the five Courts, between Belgium and Holland, in order to afford the mutual advantage of a complete contiguity of possessions; on the constitutional regime ensured to the grand duchy of Luxemburg by the treaties of 1815; on the measures that might be adopted with regard to the latter country; on the peculiar situation of the duchy of Bouillon, and, generally, on the means for the execution of the protocol of January 20, 1831. The French plenipotentiary, finally, again expressed the ardent and invariable desire which his government has constantly manifested to act in harmony with its allies, and to concur with them in the maintenance of general peace, and the treaties which form the basis of it. This communication received by the plenipotentiaries of the four Courts with unanimous and sincere satisfaction, gave them occasion on their part to declare, that they knew how to appreciate duly the spirit and aim of the same. They consider it as the happy result of the principles laid down in the protocol of March 17, in consequence of the first observations, to which the protocol of February 19 had given rise on the part of France. Greatly as they regretted even a momentary difference of opinion between them and the French

government, they now congratulate themselves upon finding, that France, by the declaration of her ambassador, continues in the position which she has taken with so much utility in the midst of her allies at the London Conferences, as she declares her adherence to the principles on which the 19th protocol is founded, and which are all deduced from the protocol of January 20; and as she thereby consolidates the union of the great Powers, which union presents the best guarantee of a general peace. With regard to the further observations with which the French plenipotentiary accompanied the above declaration, the Conference, after consideration, have unanimously agreed—first, that the discussion on the exchange of territory which might take place between Holland and Belgium was only to be assumed now as a project, but that it can only be opened with advantage when the parties immediately interested shall have acceded to the arrangements which must follow the separation of Belgium from Holland, and when the labours of the commissions for the demarcation shall have completely cleared up the question relative to the exchanges of territory, and, consequently, have facilitated the solution of it to the five Powers. Secondly, that, as the main principle of the five Powers is to respect treaties, it is evident that the stipulations of the treaties relative to the grand duchy of Luxemburg must be executed. Thirdly, that in consequence of the same principle, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts at the London Conference shall proceed to an examination of the treaties in existence relative to the duchy of Bouillon, in order to state upon the



observations made by the plenipotentiary of France, what may be peculiar in the situation of that duchy, so that a due regard for this situation may be observed in the measures, the application of which may be required towards the duchy of Luxemburg.

“ESTERHAZY.

“WESSENBERG.

“TALLEYRAND.

“PALMERSTON.

“BULOW.

“LIEVEN.

“MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

PROTOCOL of the CONFERENCES at the FOREIGN-OFFICE, held MAY 10, 1831, relative to the refusal of the BELGIC GOVERNMENT to adhere to the basis laid down by the CONFERENCE.

“The plenipotentiary of France, after having declared the full and entire assent of the government of his majesty the king of the French to the protocols twenty-one and twenty-two of the 17th of April, calls the attention of the plenipotentiaries of Austria, Great Britain, Russia, and Prussia, on the means of combining the execution and efficacy of the last of those acts, with the precautions best calculated to dispel even a pretext for all alarm relative to the preservation of general peace.

“The first question which the Congress has discussed with this view, related to the time which might be granted to the Belgian government to the definitive propositions contained in protocol 22.

“Considering that the commissioners of the five Courts at Brussels and the government of his majesty the king of the French are of opinion that a moderate de-

lay would offer a means of preparing the minds of the people in Belgium for this important communication, the plenipotentiaries have resolved that lord Ponsonby should be authorized to concert with general Balliard the previous steps which might produce the most effect in this respect, and not to communicate the 22nd protocol officially to the Belgic government till after employing all their influence to show generally the advantage which the Belgians would reap from the immediate and frank acceptance of the bases of separation to which his majesty the king of the Netherlands has already completely assented.

“It has been agreed, on the other hand, that the official communication of the protocol in question should take place at all events before the 1st of June, this year, and that on that day the delay shall expire, granted by the Congress at London to the Belgic government to place itself according to its evident interest in the same position as his majesty the king of the Netherlands with respect to the five Powers, by the acceptance of the basis of separation above-mentioned.

“The plenipotentiaries have further determined, that if on the day fixed the Belgic government declares by its official answer that it accedes to the said basis of separation, then immediate attention shall be paid to the measures necessary for the speedy evacuation of the places and territories occupied by the respective troops beyond the boundaries assigned to Belgium and Holland. In this supposition the common consent of the two parties directly interested, to which the five Courts will contribute their good offices, would



afterwards decide the exchanges of territory and arrangements, the principles of which have been laid down in article 4 of the basis of separation. If, on the contrary, these bases should not be accepted by the 1st of June by the Belgian government, the plenipotentiaries have agreed on this:—

“ 1. That according to protocol No. 2, an absolute rupture of all relations shall take place between the five Powers and the authorities which govern Belgium.

“ 2. That the five Powers, far from interposing further with the German Confederation, as they have hitherto done, to retard the adoption of the measures which the German Confederation has resolved to take in the grand duchy of Luxemburg, could not but acknowledge themselves the necessity of those measures.

“ 3. That the five Powers, considering the intimate relations which subsist between them and the German Confederation, would ask the Diet at Frankfort to give them a proof of friendship by causing to be communicated to the Congress at London confidential information respecting the intentions of the Confederation relative to the number and employment of the troops which it would cause to enter into the grand duchy of Luxemburg.

“ The entirely friendly communication in question would have no object but to enable the Congress in London to prevent the uneasiness which these military movements might excite in the adjacent countries.

“ 4. That if the Belgians should violate the armistice which they ought to observe with respect to Holland, and should attack its territory, the five Powers with

which they would thus enter *ipso facto* into a state of hostility by a violation of the engagements which they contracted the 21st of November, 1830, would have to concert the measures which they should think it their duty to oppose to such attacks, and that the first of their measures would consist in the most speedy execution of the determinations indicated in the instructions given to the commissioners of the Congress of London, on the 18th of January, which instructions are added to protocol No. 10.

“ 5. Lastly, that if these determinations should be insufficient, the Congress at London, acting in the name of the five Powers, would agree in common upon the further measures which circumstances might require for the same object.

“ The plenipotentiaries have agreed that the present protocol, which completes the disposition of that of the 17th of April, No. 22, shall also serve to complete the instructions of lord Ponsonby, and be immediately forwarded to him.”

*Protocol, May 21, 1831.*

“ Lord Ponsonby, after receiving the article No. 23, having thought it his duty to submit in person to the Congress the state of affairs in Belgium, has been heard by the plenipotentiaries of the five great Courts.

“ Considering that it results from the information given by lord Ponsonby—

“ 1. That the assent of the Belgic Congress to the basis of separation between Belgium and Holland would be essentially facilitated if the five Courts consented to support Belgium in its desire to obtain, on giving an indemnity, the grand duchy of Luxemburg.



“ 2. That the choice of a new sovereign having become indispensable to arrive at these final arrangements, the best means of obtaining the proposed object would be, to remove the difficulties which would impede the acceptance of the sovereignty of Belgium by prince Leopold. In case, as there is every reason to believe, that sovereignty should be offered to him, the plenipotentiaries have agreed to invite lord Ponsonby to return to Brussels, and to authorize him to declare,

“ 1. That the five Powers can no longer delay to require of the Belgic government its assent to the basis of the separation of Belgium and Holland, to which his majesty the king of the Netherlands has already assented.

“ 2. That paying attention to the wish expressed by the Belgic government to obtain the grand duchy for an indemnity, the five Powers promise to open a negotiation with the king of the Netherlands, in order to secure, if possible, to Belgium for a just compensation the possession of that country, which should preserve its actual relations with the German Confederation.

“ 3. That immediately after having obtained the assent of the Belgic government to the basis of separation, the five Powers would acquaint the German Confederation with this assent, as well as with the engagements taken by them to commence a negotiation for the purpose of obtaining, if possible, for Belgium, the possession of the grand duchy of Luxembourg for a just compensation; the five powers would, at the same time, invite the German Confederation to suspend, during this negotiation, the execution of the

measure resolved upon for the military occupation of the grand duchy.

“ 4. That when the Belgian government should have given its assent to the basis of separation, and the difficulties relative to the sovereignty of Belgium are removed, the negotiations necessary to carry this basis into effect should be immediately opened with the sovereign of Belgium, under the auspices of the five Powers.

“ 5. Lastly, that if this assent should not be given by the 1st of June, lord Ponsonby, in concert with general Belliard, would have to execute the instructions contained in the 23rd protocol of the 10th of May, and to acquaint the Belgic government with the determination which the five Courts have taken for this case by the said protocol. The two protocols are signed

“ ESTERHAZY.

“ WESSENBURG.

“ TALLEYRAND.

“ PALMERSTON.

“ BULOW.

“ LIEVEN.

“ MATUSCEWITSCH.”

“ *Brussels Papers, June 4.*”

---

LETTER of LORD PONSONBY to the BELGIC MINISTER of FOREIGN AFFAIRS, dated 27 MAY, 1831, communicated by the latter to the BELGIC CONGRESS, MAY 28.

“ *Brussels, May 27.*

“ Sir,—I arrived yesterday evening, and will not delay to communicate to you some ideas on the state of your affairs, as far as the Congress at London is interested in them. I therefore rely on your indulgence, which I hope will excuse the imperfections of a letter written in the greatest haste.

“ The Congress finds the bound-



aries of Holland, and treaties constitute with respect to boundaries, the law of nations. The Congress cannot violate that law; consequently it cannot consent that Belgium should assume the right to fix the frontiers of another state; but the Congress is nevertheless inclined, as far as it shall be able, without violating the fundamental principles of European policy, to remedy such things as may be contrary to the interests of Belgium, and at the same time not be injurious to the interests of the neighbouring nations. Acting with these views, the Congress desires that Belgium may place itself in the ordinary circle of European states, recognizing the common obligation of treaties, taking part in the burthens and the benefits of the policy received among nations, and constituting itself in such a manner that it may have a right to demand, that all other states should acknowledge and treat it as an associate.

“If Belgium consents to place itself in this situation, the Congress will assist it by its powerful mediation to obtain the duchy of Luxemburg by a treaty, and for an equitable indemnity; and by effectual means the Congress will prevent any military interference on the part of the German Confederation during the negotiation. It must be observed, by this mode of proceeding, Belgium will obtain this territory peaceably, and for ever—whereas, it is at least uncertain whether it will obtain it by war; and the inhabitants of the Duchy will be spared the calamities which fall on those whose country becomes the theatre of war.

“The Congress is animated by a feeling of good-will towards Bel-

gium; its real object is peace now and in future, founded on the security and independence of that country, and a definitive arrangement of all its interests.

“The Congress would therefore see with pleasure the Belgian Congress elect some sovereign who might not personally interfere with the rights of other governments, and it will recognize with particular satisfaction the prince on whom the Belgians seem especially to have turned their eyes, provided that the Congress will enable him to place himself in the common circle of the governments.

“On what principle of reason could Belgium pretend to place itself in a situation different from that under which all other nations live? Why should it demand exclusively the privilege to dictate laws to all other nations on questions of disputed territory, and to withdraw itself from the obligation of observing the general rule of negotiations and treaties, pretending all at once to have recourse to violence and war to secure what it considers as its rights? Is Belgium powerful enough to force the military five great nations of Europe to subscribe to its wishes?

“Do some persons think that the people of Europe may be excited to resistance to their respective governments in order to enable Belgium to destroy the authority of treaties, the only principle that preserves nations from a perpetual war? There can be no more serious and dangerous error than such an opinion.

“The great powers are sufficiently aware of their true interests not to dispute among themselves on the Belgic question—that is to say, on the question whether treaties ought to be observed.



“On the contrary, they will act with unanimity, and they will have the concurrence and approbation of their people.

“Belgium is excited to have recourse to arms, and why? To retain Luxemburg. But it may possess it in peace and security for the thousandth part of the price which an attempt to keep that country by force of arms would cost: is it not imprudent to hesitate on the choice?

“Belgium desires to conquer Maestricht, the left bank of the Scheldt, and to take from Holland some other parts of its ancient possessions. Now that the policy of Europe is evident even to the least enlightened mind, can it still be doubted that Belgium is unable to obtain any one of these things by force of arms, unless it succeeds in conquering the armies of France, of Prussia, of Austria, and of England? Not an inch of Dutch territory will be left to Belgium, unless it has vanquished Europe—to say nothing of what it might lose of its own territory if it should happen to be vanquished itself in such a contest.

“It is for the statesmen who direct the destinies of nations to calculate the chances of success or defeat. It is for them to show their countrymen whether it is better to seek success in their views by such means and in such circumstances, or to try the simple, inoffensive, and more effectual means which negotiations afford under a prince, the friend of all the Governments of Europe, and in the consolidation of whose power and security all may be interested.

“The hesitation which his royal highness prince Leopold has shown in the answers which he has made to the deputies who sounded his opinion with respect to the sove-

reignty of Belgium, sufficiently shows the disinterested nature of his royal highness's principles, and that his royal highness would not accept a crown which should be offered to him, if he could not wear it with honour to Belgium and himself. However, the prince is now convinced, to his entire satisfaction, that he is sufficiently authorized to expect with confidence the equitable and speedy execution of the measures by which the Congress will assist in the satisfactory arrangement of the affairs of Luxemburg; and the prince is ready to take upon himself as sovereign the completion of this affair.

“Can there be a better proof of the change which has taken place in the opinion and the resolution of the Congress? A week ago the Congress considered the preservation of that duchy to the House of Nassau, if not as necessary, at least as extremely desirable, and at present it is inclined to a mediation, with the avowed intention of obtaining that duchy for the sovereign of Belgium.

“The honour of Belgium consists in obtaining Luxemburg, and not in fighting to have it, and insuring the ruin of Belgium by the struggle.

“The Congress does not pretend to interfere in what concerns the rights, the independence of Belgium, or its internal organization, but it will maintain the rights of other states against all aggression, under any pretext whatever.

“There shall be no new mode of conquest set up by one power apart from the rest. The Congress will remain the protector of laws and of liberty, against all those who should attempt to become conquerors, and against those who should disregard any laws but their own will and pleasure. The Belgians



cannot consider it as wise policy to assert the right of force, and to recognize it as supreme and absolute, without exposing themselves, at the same time, to see the doctrine turned against themselves.

“What is asked of Belgium, that it may find itself in a tranquil and safe situation? All that is asked of it is, to condescend to show itself subject to the same political duties to which the great monarchies submit. Can that which France, Austria, England, &c. &c. find just and honourable, wound the honour of Belgium? I have confidence in the good sense of the Belgian government and of the country; I flatter myself that they will consider with calmness and decide with wisdom the great question which is laid before them, and that they will refuse imprudently to plunge themselves into difficulties which would be created without need, and which might lead even to the extinction of the Belgic name. As for the debt, I can repeat to you the assurance that the Congress has never meant any more than to make proposals.

“Believe me Sir, your very humble servant,

(Signed) “PONSONBY.

“*To M. Lebeau, Minister for Foreign Affairs.*”

---

NOTES of the DUTCH GOVERNMENT relative to the REFUSAL of BELGIUM, and ANSWER of the CONFERENCE, JUNE 5, 7, 1831.

*Protocol of the Conference at the Foreign Office, London, June 6th; present, the Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.*

“Having considered the reports made to them by lord Ponsonby up to the 4th of the present month,

forwarded to them from Brussels, as also the two notes hereunto appended of the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands.

“After having examined on the one side of the said reports and notes, and on the other side the contents of the protocols No. 22, 23, and 24, the plenipotentiaries resolved to send the appended letter to lord Ponsonby, and to the representatives of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, both the answers, the originals of which are hereunto appended.

(Signed) “ESTERHAZY.

“WESSENBERG.

“TALLEYRAND.

“PALMERSTON.

“BULOW.

“LIEVEN.

“MATUSCEWITSCH.”

#### APPENDIX, No. 1.

“The undersigned plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands have the honour to remind lord Palmerston of the contents of the note which they, on the 21st of May, laid before the London Conference. In this it was declared, that if the Belgians did not at once consent to the conditions determined by the five Courts, as a fundamental principle of the separation, his majesty would consider himself free to act on his own account, that that tedious uncertainty might terminate, which is so highly injurious to the interests of his faithful subjects. Taking into consideration the resolutions of the Conference of the 10th of May, the undersigned cannot doubt but that the 22nd protocol was received at Brussels before the 1st of June, and must have directly been followed by an answer, stating either that the Belgian government had acceded



to the above-named fundamental conditions of separation, and placed themselves in the same position with regard to the five Powers in which the king of the Netherlands now finds himself, or that the said conditions are not accepted by that government.

“ Since, however, several days have elapsed after the term granted by the London Conference to the Belgian government, the undersigned fulfil an imperative duty by requesting an explanation with regard to the information obtained, in order that their sovereign, on learning the result, which they will immediately have communicated, may take such measures as in the present state of things are required, as well as regards the dignity as the safety of Holland.

“ The undersigned request lord Palmerston to communicate the present note to the plenipotentiaries, and, expecting that he will honour them with an answer, they embrace this opportunity of repeating the assurance of their high regard.

“ FALCK.

“ H. VAN ZUYLEN VAN NYEVELT.

“ *Dated London, June 5.*

“ *To his Excellency, Lord Palmerston, &c.*”

#### APPENDIX, No. 2.

“ The undersigned plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands perform an imperious duty in drawing the attention of lord Palmerston, and, through his influence, that of the London Conference, to the letter which lord Ponsonby wrote to Mr. Lebeau, dated the 27th of May last, a letter which was communicated to the (so called) Brussels Congress, published in all the newspapers, and submitted to the

consideration of the said assembly.

“ Without alluding to the other painful feelings which the reading of that paper has given rise to, the under-mentioned will content themselves by objecting in the strongest way to every thing which the agent of the Conference has thought fit to introduce, regarding an eventual cession of the grand duchy of Luxemburg.

“ By the way in which lord Ponsonby in this letter has spoken of the proposed cession, he has arrogated a right that no person could delegate to him. He has flattered, with a deceitful hope, the engrossing spirit which has distinguished the revolt, and has encroached on the inalienable rights of the king, by promises directly opposed to the decisive and unvaried language of the representatives of his majesty's government here as well as in the Hague.

“ The king abides by the act of separation which was proposed by the five Powers, and is accepted by him without reservation. By article 2nd of that act, the grand duchy is expressly acknowledged as belonging to the House of Nassau. It is therefore difficult to comprehend how any idea should have arisen of any negotiation respecting that sovereignty, which, even after the unconditional acceptance of the grounds of the separation by Belgium, would have been still subject to the greatest difficulties, because that duchy was granted in place of their hereditary possessions to the king and the princes of the House, and, in his eyes, is of inestimable value. Consequently the undersigned must protest against that part of lord Ponsonby's letter, which they most positively now do by this, contra-



dicting it entirely, and leaving the consequences of it to the writer.

"They have the honour, &c.

(Signed)

"FALCK.

"H. VAN ZUYLEN VAN NYEVELT.

"*London, June 6.*

*To his Excellency, Lord  
Palmerston, &c."*

#### APPENDIX, No. 3.

"*Foreign Office, June 7.*

"The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, have taken into consideration the note of Messrs. the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, dated the 5th inst., communicated through lord Ponsonby.

"In answer to this note, the undersigned consider it their duty to inform their excellencies the plenipotentiaries of the king of the Netherlands, that, according to information received yesterday from Brussels, the Belgians have not placed themselves, by accepting the conditions of separation, in the same relation to the five Powers in which his majesty the king of the Netherlands, having entirely complied with the said conditions, is now placed. That lord Ponsonby is positively recalled, and that general Belliard had received orders from his majesty the king of the French to leave Brussels so soon as lord Ponsonby had left it; and that the Conference were employed in concerting the measures which their engagements with the king of the Netherlands may require.

"The undersigned take this opportunity of assuring their excellencies Messrs. Falck and baron

Van Zuylen Van Nyevelt of their distinguished regard.

(Signed) "ESTERHAZY.

"WESSENBERG.

"TALLEYRAND.

"PALMERSTON.

"BULOW.

"LIEVEN.

"MATUSCEWITSCH.

"*To their excellencies, Baron Falck;  
Van Zuylen Van Nyevelt."*

#### APPENDIX, No. 4.

*London, Foreign Office, June 7.*

"The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, having taken into serious consideration the note of the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, dated the 6th of this month, communicated to them through lord Palmerston, and which had reference to a confidential letter of lord Ponsonby, published in the Belgian newspapers, the Conference in its ignorance of lord Ponsonby's letter, cannot do otherwise than refer to the protocol No. 24, dated 21st of May last, which protocol has already been communicated to the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands.

"In that state paper three principles are laid down, namely, in the first place, that the arrangements which might lead to give Belgium the certain possession or sovereignty of Luxemburg should be entered into by mutual consent. Secondly, that its possession could not be obtained otherwise than in exchange for reasonable equivalents. And in the third place, that the five Powers should make no proposition regarding the proposed arrangement, until the Belgians had submitted to the fun-



damental conditions of separation which they (the five Powers) had fixed, and which the king of the Netherlands had complied with.

“ These principles are those of the five Powers, and shall remain always such. They in no ways shackle his majesty the king of the Netherlands in acting as he thinks fit regarding that object, and indeed, far from encroaching on his rights; on the contrary, they give proof of their respect for them, and tend only to accomplish such arrangements as would promote the interests which the king has so much at heart, and likewise to secure that peace, the maintaining of which corresponds with his interest as much as with that of the five Powers.

“ The undersigned gladly take this opportunity to renew their assurances of their high regard to their excellencies Falck and Van Zuylen Van Nyevelt.

(Signed) “ ESTERHAZY.  
 “ WESSENBERG.  
 “ TALLEYRAND.  
 “ PALMERSTON.  
 “ BULOW.  
 “ LIEVEN.  
 “ MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

PRELIMINARY ARTICLES *communicated 26th JUNE, 1831, by the CONFERENCE of LONDON, to the BELGIC COMMISSIONERS.*

“ *To M. Lebeau, at Brussels.*

“ The Conference, animated with a desire to remove the difficulties which still retard the conclusion of the affairs of Belgium, has thought that the following articles, which might form the preliminaries of a treaty of peace, would contribute to this end. It has therefore resolved to propose them to the two parties.

“ Art. 1. The limits of Holland shall comprehend all the territories, fortresses, towns, and places, which belonged to the former republic of the united provinces of the Netherlands in the year 1790.

“ Art. 2. Belgium shall be formed of all the other territories which received the denomination of the kingdom of the Netherlands in the treaties of 1815.

“ Art. 3. The five Powers will employ their good offices that the duchy of Luxemburg may remain in *statu quo* during the course of the separate negotiation which the sovereign of Belgium will open with the king of the Netherlands, and with the German Confederation, respecting the grand duchy, which negotiation is distinct from the question of the boundaries between Holland and Belgium.

“ It is understood that the fortress of Luxemburg shall preserve a free communication with Germany.

“ Art. 4. If it is found that the republic of the united provinces of the Netherlands did not exclusively exercise the sovereignty of Maastricht in 1790, the two parties shall consider of means of making an amicable arrangement on this subject.

“ Art. 5. As it would result from the bases laid down in articles 1 and 2, that Holland and Belgium would possess districts surrounded by the respective territories of each other, such exchanges as may be thought useful to both parties shall be amicably made between Holland and Belgium.

“ Art. 6. The reciprocal evacuation of the territories, towns, and fortresses shall take place independently of the arrangements relative to the exchanges.

“ Art. 7. It is understood that



the regulations of articles 108 to 117 inclusive, of the general act of the Congress of Vienna, relative to the free navigation of the navigable rivers, shall be applied to those rivers which pass through the territories of Holland and Belgium.

“ Art. 8. Dutch and Belgian commissioners shall meet at Maestricht as soon as possible, for the demarcation of the territories. They shall also discuss the exchanges to be made according to article 5.

“ Arts. 9 and 10. Belgium shall be a neutral state, but without giving up the right of defending itself against every aggression.

“ Art. 11. The port of Antwerp shall continue to be solely a commercial port, according to article 15 of the treaty of Paris of the 30th of May, 1814.

“ Art. 12. The division of the debt shall be made in such a manner that the whole of the debts before the union shall fall upon the country by which they were contracted, and those contracted since the union shall be divided in a just proportion.

“ Art. 13. Commissioners shall be immediately appointed to settle this matter, so that Belgium may provisionally furnish its portion of the interest of the debt.

“ Art. 14. The prisoners of war, on both sides, shall be set at liberty fifteen days after the adoption of these articles.

“ Art. 15. The sequestration of private property in the two countries shall be immediately removed.

“ Art. 16. No inhabitant of the territories, towns, and fortresses, reciprocally evacuated, shall be molested for his past political conduct.

“ Art. 17. The five Powers reserve to themselves the right of

giving their good offices when they shall be required by the parties interested.

“ Art. 18. The articles reciprocally adopted shall be converted into a definitive treaty.

(Signed) “ ESTERHAZY.

“ TALLEYRAND.

“ PALMERSTON.

“ BULOW.

“ MATUSCEWITSCH.

“ A true copy

(Signed) “ PALMERSTON.”

---

CORRESPONDENCE *between the CONFERENCE and the DUTCH GOVERNMENT, regarding the entrance of the Troops of the latter into BELGIUM, 1—8 JUNE, 1831.*

“ To the Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.

“ I have had the honour to receive the letters which your excellencies have written to me the 25th of July, and by which they express their hope that, notwithstanding the declarations contained in my despatch of the 12th of the same month, fresh negotiations tending towards the conclusion of a definitive treaty under the auspices of the five Courts, might bring about a satisfactory arrangement. You requested me, at the same time, to propose to the king that his plenipotentiaries in London should be furnished with the necessary powers and instructions in order to discuss, conclude, and sign such a treaty.

“ His majesty, who has not ceased to give proofs of his sincere wish to co-operate in an arrangement, and to secure, as far as he can, the benefits of peace for his subjects, and for the whole of Europe, and



who is still animated with the same feelings, has consequently authorized me to furnish the said plenipotentiaries with the powers and instructions necessary to discuss, conclude, and sign with your excellencies a definitive treaty, the object of which will be to settle the separation between Holland and Belgium according to the principles laid down in my despatch on the 12th of July, and already agreed upon between the five Courts and his majesty.

“ In obedience to the king’s intentions, I am obliged to add, that his majesty has determined upon supporting the negotiations by his military means—a determination which the recent events in Belgium have rendered imperious, since we have seen a prince putting himself in possession of the sovereignty in that country, without having previously fulfilled the conditions established by the Conference in the 12th and 19th protocols, and taking an unrestricted oath to a constitution derogatory to the territorial rights of his majesty and of Holland.

“ As the plan of establishing an armistice has never been realized, there exists at the present moment only a cessation of hostilities. The Netherlands plenipotentiaries have already, by their note of the 21st of May, declared that his majesty could not subject his dominions to an indefinite prolongation of the provisional state of things, and that, from the 1st of June next, he would consider himself at liberty either to co-operate in the measures to be adopted by the five Powers in order to realize the separation according to the Appendix A of the 12th protocol, or to act on his own account, and in the manner which circumstances would seem to re-

quire, but always for the purpose only of arriving at the state of things which the act of separation had acknowledged to be just and convenient.

“ The 5th of June the Netherlands plenipotentiaries thought it their duty to inquire what result had been obtained, in order that the king might take the measures requisite as well for his own dignity as for the security of Holland. By a reply, dated June 7, the Conference informed them that it was considering the measures that might be required by the engagements which the five Powers had contracted towards the king; and lastly, by their note of the 22nd of June, the plenipotentiaries announced again that the king, firmly resolved not to give up any of the rights that he had acquired by his adhesion, would persist in the reservation with which the Conferences had already become qualified respecting his co-operation in the measures the Conference should think fit to adopt; and that when the representatives of the five Courts at the Hague had expressed a wish that his majesty might not immediately avail himself of that reservation, a satisfactory answer had been given, but that they, at the same time, had been requested to declare that this answer rested upon the supposition that the Conference would, on their part, proceed without delay to the execution of the 12th protocol; and that if this supposition should not be realized, no alternative would be left to the king but to make use of his own means, and to abandon a system of condescension which would no longer be compatible with the safety of the state, nor with the interest of his faithful subjects. The very step just mentioned of



the representatives of the five Courts at the Hague evidently shows that at that period the Conference was convinced of the king's right to recommence hostilities.

“ Since the date of the diplomatic papers which I have quoted, new motives have arisen for strengthening the disposition already expressed in the name of his majesty ; but whatever may be the results, they will never produce the least alteration in the king's wishes for the success of the efforts which your excellencies and his own plenipotentiaries are about to make, in order to conclude an arrangement for the final separation on principles conformable to the acknowledged rights of his majesty and of Holland.

“ *The Hague, August 1, 1831.*”

“ *To his Excellency Baron Verstolk de Soelen, &c. &c.*

“ *London, Aug. 5.*

“ M. le Baron,—By the letter which your excellency did us the honour to represent to us, on the 1st of August, you had the goodness to inform us, that it is the intention of the king, your august master, to support by military measures (*par des mesures militaires*) the negotiation which his plenipotentiaries are commissioned to open at London.

“ We should have supposed that these measures would be adopted only in the interior of the territory of Holland, if public report did not inform us that they have been extended beyond its frontiers,—that hostilities have been resumed against the Belgians by the king's orders, and that the armistice, concluded at Antwerp, has just been denounced.

“ Not having been able to ob-

tain from the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands any explanation of these facts, we still refuse to believe that the king, at the very moment when he communicated to us his intention of negotiating a definitive treaty of peace, can have taken the resolution to rekindle the flames of war, and to lead to the destruction of a commercial city,—an event deplorable in itself, and which by the sentiments of hatred and revenge to which it would excite, might, perhaps, almost render it impossible to conclude a peace so much desired by the king and by Holland. Your excellency knows the grounds of general interest which led the five Powers in November last to effect a suspension of arms between Holland and Belgium. You know the engagements which subsist on this subject between the Powers, and which were mentioned in express terms in the letters which we had the honour to address to your excellency on the 25th of July. Their motives and their engagements are still the same. The tranquillity of Europe is connected with them. We hope that it will be sufficient to allude to them here, and that your excellency will not fail to obtain from the king the necessary orders that all hostilities may cease without delay, that his majesty's troops may retire within the frontiers of his territory, and that the city of Antwerp may not be exposed to a catastrophe which would be infinitely to be regretted.

“ These demands, founded on our engagements, will no doubt be favourably received by his majesty. We take pleasure in believing that such will be the case, and request your excellency to honour us with a speedy and satisfactory answer. We have not failed to



call on the Belgians to cease the hostilities which they may have resumed, in consequence of the movements made by the king's troops. Accept, Sir, the new assurance of our distinguished consideration.

(Signed) "ESTERHAZY.  
"WESSENBERG.  
"TALLEYRAND.  
"PALMERSTON.  
"BULOW.  
"LIEVEN.  
"MATUSCEWITSCH."

The answer to this letter is in the following terms:—

"*To their Excellencies the Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, assembled in Conference at London.*

"*The Hague, Aug. 8.*

"I have had the honour to receive the letter of your excellencies of the fifth of August, in which you have been pleased to inform me that the Conference at London had understood the support of the negotiations by military measures mentioned in my letter of the 1st of August, as if it meant measures to be adopted in the interior of the territory of Holland.

"I must take the liberty to observe, that the terms in which this part of my letter is drawn up appeared explicit here. 'The King,' I had the honour to say, 'had resolved to support the negotiations by his military means (*moyens militaires*), —a determination which has become doubly necessary since the events which have lately taken place in Belgium.' We thought that these words clearly expressed that a new determination was meant, not an intention of remaining in the passive atti-

tude of the last nine months—an attitude to which this observation could not apply, that it had become necessary since the late events; nor the exposition which the latter part of my letter was destined to demonstrate, the power to recommence hostilities which was repeatedly made during the negotiations on the part of the king. I took the liberty to add, that whatever might be the result of these dispositions of his majesty they would by no means diminish his desire for the happy success of the negotiation. Besides, I made a point of giving, on the morning of the departure of baron Zuylen de Nyevelt, as well as in the evening and following morning to the representatives of the five Courts at the Hague, all the explanations which they thought proper to ask.

"As for the city of Antwerp, I am happy to be able to confirm the opinion of your excellencies that the king has by no means taken the resolution to cause the destruction of that commercial city, —a resolution which would be at once incompatible with the exalted sentiments of his majesty, and with the wishes which he has never ceased to form for the happiness of Belgium. The sally lately made by the garrison of Antwerp was intended, not to injure the habitations, but to spike the cannon which had been planted against the citadel, and which were evidence of the abuse that had been made of the suspension of arms. The direction of the military operations being confided to the prince of Orange, it will depend upon his royal highness to determine those which may concern the city of Antwerp; but at all events his royal highness will undoubtedly follow his own natural inclination



to spare the peaceable inhabitants and their property.

"I beg your excellencies to be convinced that the present movements of the royal army, far from being dictated by motives of policy or vengeance must be considered, merely as coercive measures, such as the Conference at London itself had manifested its intention to employ against Belgium, in case of the non-acceptance of appendix A. to Protocol 12, and which the king on his part had reserved to himself a right of employing. Solely destined to support a negotiation for which the plenipotentiaries of his majesty are furnished with the most extensive instructions and full powers, favoured by the kind co-operation of your excellencies, and having for its object purely domestic interests concerning the relations between Holland and Belgium, they are entirely foreign to that part of the Belgian question which has been thought to interest Europe, to which the king has made the sacrifice of the separation between Holland and Belgium. The conclusion of the definitive treaty, which his majesty hopes is very near, will at once put an end to the military operations; but when the question is to save and secure the existence of Holland by an equitable treaty of separation, his majesty as a constitutional monarch, reigning over a free people, cannot adopt any course but such as is in harmony with the public spirit of the nation and unanimously sanctioned by the two chambers of the national representation. I beg your excellencies to accept, &c.

(Signed)

"VERSTOLK VAN SOELEN."

The minister, after reading the above documents, spoke as fol-

lows:—"Upon the refusal of Belgium to negotiate the definitive treaty of peace at London till an agreement should be made respecting the principles which, as it was expressed in the refusal, can be no others than those of the proposed 18 preliminary articles, the Conference again insisted at Brussels on the sending of plenipotentiaries to negotiate a definitive treaty, with the remark, that on the speedy conclusion of such a treaty even the political existence of the Belgians depends. While this was determined in London, France had resolved eventually to assist Belgium with an army. In the afternoon of the 8th inst., the French Chargé d' Affaires communicated to me a letter dated from the minister of Foreign affairs at Paris, stating, that in consequence of the denunciation of the armistice on our side, Belgium had applied to the king of the French for assistance; that it would be given if Belgium should have need of it to repel the attack; and that if the Dutch army did not immediately retire within the line fixed by the armistice, it would have to combat a French army, and that the French Chargé d' Affaires would leave the Hague.

Almost at the same time the Dutch government received a report, the authenticity of which cannot be doubted, that the London Conference had assented to the assistance eventually to be given to Belgium by a French military force, and had accepted the offer of a fleet made by England. The same report mentions a convention relative to the stay of the French troops in Belgium; stipulating, among other things, that the French army shall not enter Holland.



“When the king took the resolution to support by arms the basis of separation between Holland and Belgium, all the possible consequences of that important step were taken into the account. Even the present circumstance was calculated upon, though it was considered one of the least probable. Nevertheless, as it has now come to pass, it is the duty of the government to direct its course accordingly.

“The following letter from me to the king’s ambassador at Paris will show in what manner his majesty has thought himself called upon to act under these circumstances. F. I.

“A calm consideration of the course of the negotiations leads to the following conclusions:—

“When Belgium separated herself from Holland, the five greatest Powers in Europe united to restore tranquillity in the kingdom of the Netherlands, and then proceeded to determine equitable bases of separation between Holland and Belgium. Such bases were laid down by them with the announcement of compulsory measures in case they should be rejected. The rejection took place on the part of Belgium. In vain did Holland, which had accepted the basis, call during several months for the application of these measures to Belgium, as well in order to regulate the separation on the principles laid down as to check daily violations of the suspension of arms; for instead of doing this, new bases were laid down entirely to the advantage of Belgium. Holland, abiding by the first, which had become obligatory between the five Powers and the king, resolved to employ arms to make them accepted by the Belgians, upon

which the five Courts now declare, without delay, that they will proceed to apply, for the advantage of Belgium, that force which the king has in vain invoked in support of his own just cause.

“In such a state of things, his majesty was advised not to depart from the system which he has adopted. Our difference with Belgium is declared to be a domestic difference, and by no means to concern Europe. The courage of our troops has at the beginning gloriously triumphed in Belgium, but the difference would become European if the king should retain his arms in his hand against the preponderance of the Powers represented in the Conference at London; and it can never be the object of his majesty to shed the precious blood of his Dutch subjects in fruitless enterprises. Should, therefore, a French army enter Belgium, that of the Netherlands shall retire into our ancient territory. In this result, also, history and impartial posterity will judge, that in the midst of enervated Europe, Holland unanimously supported the head of the state, maintained its ancient reputation in defence of its rights; that it never hesitated to speak freely and to act freely; that in the most critical circumstances that perhaps ever occurred to a state, it undertook one of the most magnanimous enterprises recorded in history, and was able, in a few days, to compel a country, containing a population double its own, and which had dared to provoke, and to calumniate, the courage of its soldiers, to renounce all hope of saving itself by its own resources.”

A very long report of the prince of Orange, dated from his headquarters at Curingen, 8th of Au-



gust, gives an account of the defeat of the army of the Meuse, under general Daine.

---

PROTOCOLS of the CONFERENCE of LONDON, regarding the ENTRANCE of the DUTCH TROOPS into BELGIUM, 6th, 12th, 18th, 23rd AUGUST, 1831.

*Foreign Office, Aug. 6, 1831.*

Present :—The Plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia.

“ The plenipotentiary of his Britannic majesty opened the Conference by making to the plenipotentiaries of the four other Powers the following declaration :

“ That the moment the government of his Britannic majesty received information of the renewal of hostilities between Holland and Belgium, it gave orders for a division of the fleet to assemble as soon as possible in the Downs, where it would be ready to concur in any measure which might be deemed necessary for the re-establishment of the armistice which the five Powers had engaged to maintain between Holland and Belgium, and that after the dispatch of this order, the new sovereign of Belgium had claimed the assistance of the five Powers, and, more especially, naval succour, from Great Britain.

“ The plenipotentiary of his majesty the king of the French declared that the sovereign of Belgium had just required the armed intervention of France, in consequence of the renewal of hostilities between Holland and Belgium, and he had even added, that the necessity for the assistance of the French government was ex-

tremely urgent, and that there was not a minute to be lost to prevent a general conflagration.

“ The danger being so pressing, the king of the French decided immediately upon forming an army to march to the succour of the Belgians, and drive the Dutch troops back upon their own territory.

“ The plenipotentiaries of the four other Courts having made the plenipotentiary of France acquainted with the declarations expressed on the same subject by the French government to the representatives of those four Courts at Paris, the plenipotentiary of France, referring to those declarations, announced that as soon as the object they pointed out should be attained, the French army would return into the department du Nord.

“ These declarations having been made, the Conference considered that, on one side, France, in coming to the determination she had adopted, had not had time to fulfil the obligation, which she was fully desirous to do, of acting in concert with her allies ; but, on the other hand, she had manifested an intention of not availing herself of the measures taken, but in execution of the engagements entered into between the five Powers relative to the maintenance of the armistice between Holland and Belgium.

“ Consequently, the plenipotentiaries of the five Powers regarded the entrance of the French troops into Belgium, as having taken place not with any intention peculiar to France, but for an object towards which the deliberations of the Conference were directed, and it remained understood that the extent to be given to the



operations of these troops and their continuance in Belgium should be fixed by common agreement between the five Courts at the Conference in London.

"It also remained understood, that in case the co-operation of the English fleet should be required, this fleet should act only for the purpose of accomplishing the same views and upon the same principles.

"Besides, it remained agreed that the French troops should not pass the ancient frontiers of Holland, that their operations should be confined to the left bank of the Meuse, and that under no circumstances should they invest the fortress of Maestricht, or that of Venloo, because then the war would be carried too near the frontiers of Prussia and Germany, and might give rise to serious and complicated questions which the Powers were desirous of avoiding; and finally, that in conformity with the declarations made by the French government to the representatives of the four Courts at Paris, the French troops should retire within the limits of France, as soon as the armistice was re-established as it existed before the renewal of hostilities.

"Finally, the Conference agreed that these last events ought to induce it the more strongly to occupy itself with a definitive treaty calculated to put an end to all differences between Holland and Belgium, and which was indispensable for the maintenance of the general peace.

(Signed) "ESTERHAZY.  
"WESSENBERG.  
"TALLEYRAND.  
"PALMERSTON.  
"BULOW,

"LIEVEN.

"MATUSCEWITSCH."

*Protocol of the Conference held at the Foreign Office, on the 12th of August, 1831.*

Present:—The plenipotentiaries of Austria, of France, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia.

"The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts having assembled in Conference, have read the annexed letter of baron Verstolk de Soelen, in answer to that which they addressed on the 5th inst. to that minister, respecting the hostilities which had again taken place between Holland and Belgium. The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have, moreover, taken into consideration a communication which was made to them by the plenipotentiaries of the king of the Netherlands, and considering that it results from this communication, as well as from information received direct from Holland and from Belgium, that an order to put an end to the hostilities, and to withdraw beyond the line of the armistice, had been despatched to the troops of the king of the Netherlands, and that the cessation of hostilities and the withdrawal of the troops must by this time have taken place, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have resolved to authenticate the communication of the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands, by joining it to the present Protocol, and have reserved to themselves the option of fixing interiorly, and according to circumstances, the determination that it may be necessary for them to adopt."

Signed, &c.



*Protocol of the Conférence held at the Foreign Office, the 18th of August, 1831.*

Present :—The plenipotentiaries of Austria, of France, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts having met, the plenipotentiary of France made a communication, stating that the French army which had entered Belgium had commenced its retreat, and that 20,000 men had received orders to return immediately to France. It was agreed that this communication should be authenticated, and not having as yet received any official information of the withdrawing of the troops of his majesty the king of the Netherlands to the Dutch territory, the plenipotentiaries reserved to themselves, conformably to the Protocol No. 31, to agree later on the period at which the occupation of Belgium by the French troops is to cease entirely.”

Signed, &c.

*Protocol of the Conference held at the Foreign Office, the 23rd of August, 1831.*

Present :—The plenipotentiaries of Austria, of France, of Great Britain, of Prussia, and of Russia.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts being assembled, have taken into consideration the annexed note by which the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands have officially informed them of the withdrawing of the troops of the king to the territory of Holland. After the

communication of this document, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have taken into consideration the means of preventing the renewal of hostilities between Holland and Belgium, of bringing about a speedy cessation of the measure the adoption of which was provoked by the hostilities that have recently taken place, and of accomplishing the solution of the questions which remain to be regulated, in order to establish a durable peace between the two countries. Considering that for these important results to be brought about afresh, suspension of hostilities is indispensable, but that a suspension of hostilities for a fixed time would be more appropriate than an undefined suspension of hostilities, to the actual state of the negotiations, to the well-founded hope now entertained by the Powers of bringing about a final arrangement between Holland and Belgium, and to the necessity that exists for this arrangement, both as regards the parties directly interested in it and the maintenance of a general peace, the plenipotentiaries have resolved to propose to the government of his majesty the king of the Netherlands and to the Belgian government—

“The establishment of a suspension of hostilities for six weeks. This suspension of hostilities to be placed under the guarantee of the five Powers, and if one of the two parties should violate it, that party to be considered in a state of hostility with the said Powers. During the suspension of hostilities, the respective troops are to remain beyond the line that separated them before the resumption of hostilities.



“They are to enjoy reciprocally full liberty of communication, and to abstain from all acts of aggression, and from any measure that may be productive of injury towards the adverse party.

“This said suspension of hostilities to be taken advantage of by the five Powers, in order to bring about that final arrangement between Holland and Belgium which is the object of their wishes and of their efforts.

“ESTERHAZY.

“WESSENBERG.

“TALLEYRAND.

“PALMERSTON.

“BULOW.

“LIEVEN.

“MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

PROTOCOL of the CONFERENCE of  
LONDON, 6th OCTOBER, 1831,  
*apportioning the DEBT between*  
HOLLAND and BELGIUM.

“The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts having assembled, have taken cognizance of the annexed letter, by which the plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands have communicated to the Conference, in reply to the letter which had been addressed to them on the 30th of September, two tables, the first of which shows the amount and annual interest of the debts contracted since the Union of Belgium with Holland, by the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, by virtue of laws passed by the states-general; and the second, the amount of the charges of the service of the total debt of the united kingdom of the Netherlands, according to the last budgets voted by the states-general.

“Considering that the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands gua-

rantee the correctness of the tables, and that consequently, if they are incorrect, in spite of such a formal guarantee, the five Courts will by that circumstance have the right to regard as well the results of the calculations to which the tables in question serve as bases, the Conference proceeded to the examination of the mode to be adopted, with a view to insure an equitable division of the debts and charges above mentioned between Holland and Belgium.

“In this labour the Conference has had particularly in view the principle of Article 6 of the protocol of July 21, 1814, annexed to the general act of the Congress of Vienna, which, with respect to Holland and Belgium, declares—

“‘That as the expenses ought to be in common, as well as the profits, the debts contracted up to the period of the Union, by the Dutch provinces on the one hand, and the Belgic provinces on the other, will be at the charge of the general treasury of the Netherlands.’

“The Conference recognising that, according to this principle, Holland possessed, during the union, a right to the assistance of Belgium, to the payment of the aggregate debt of the kingdom of the Netherlands, and that there ought to be a complete reciprocity of expenses and profits between the two countries, has unanimously agreed that it would be contrary to this fundamental principle to make a valuation of the private profits which Holland or Belgium may derive from loans contracted during the union, or to specify the charges connected with these loans, and that, therefore, it would only be proper to take as the share of the debts contracted in common,



the proportion of the respective population, or that of the duties paid by the provinces of which Belgium and Holland will be composed on separating.

“This last proportion having appeared to be the most equitable, as it is founded upon the portion which each of the two countries has really contributed to the payment of the debts in common, contracted during the union, the Conference therefore decided, as well by the protocol No. 12 of 27th of January 1831, as by the letter here annexed of the Dutch plenipotentiaries, that the average proportion resulting from the budgets of the kingdom of the Netherlands of 1827, 1828, and 1829, the two great divisions of this kingdom have contributed to the payment of the direct and indirect contributions—the one for 15-31, and the other for 16-31. The plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have adopted this calculation, always taking care that the average proportion in question, according to the rules of equity, should be reduced in favour of Belgium, because, according to the territorial arrangements to be agreed upon, Holland would possess a territory which did not belong to her in 1790. In consequence of which the Conference have considered it equitable that the debts contracted during the re-union of the Netherlands should be divided between Holland and Belgium in the proportion of 15-30, or an equal portion to each.

“The interest (*rente*) of the whole of the debts above stated amounts in round numbers to 10,100,000 florins of the Netherlands. The result will be a sum for Belgium of 5,050,000 florins of the Netherlands,

“In addition, the Austro-Belgic debt having belonged exclusively to Belgium before the re-union with Holland, it was considered equally equitable that this debt should be in future borne entirely by Belgium. The interest at  $2\frac{1}{2}$  per cent of that part called active of the debt, as well as the service of *amortissement* of that part called “deferred” being estimated in round numbers at 700,000 Belgic florins of interest (*rente*), Belgium would have to support under this second head another charge of 700,000 florins of *rente*.

“The Conference, proceeding according to the rules of equity, has found that, in conformity with the principles and views by which it is actuated, another debt, which was originally charged upon Belgium before its union with Holland—namely, the debt inscribed, on account of Belgium, in the great book of the French empire, and which, according to its budgets, has accumulated to 4,000,000 francs, or 2,000,000 florins of the Netherlands, of *rente*, must again be placed to the account of the Belgic treasury. The sum, therefore, with which Belgium will be charged under this new head, will be 2,000,000 florins of the Netherlands, annual *rente*.

“Lastly, with regard to the advantages of navigation and commerce which Holland is called upon to give up to the Belgians, and to the sacrifices of various kinds to which on her side the separation leads, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have considered that to the three points above indicated, there ought to be added a sum of 6,000,000 florins of rent, which will form, with the sums already mentioned, a total of 8,400,000 florins of the Netherlands.



“ It is, therefore, an annual rente of 8,400,000 florins with which Belgium will remain definitively charged, in consequence of the division of the public debt of the united kingdom of the Netherlands, according to the unanimous opinion of the Conference.

“ On the other hand, the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have observed, that the *syndicat d’amortissement* instituted in the kingdom of the Netherlands, has contracted debts, half the interest of which has been borne to the charge of Belgium, but having also, according to the nature of the institution itself, accounts to render, from which a surplus may result, Belgium is entitled to participate in this surplus, on its being ascertained as a means of liquidation in the proportion in which it has participated in the payment of direct and indirect taxes, and the excise in the kingdom of the Netherlands.

“ It has been, therefore, agreed, that the article on the division of the debt, in the definitive arrangement of which the Conference is occupied, shall be prepared according to the principles laid down in the present protocol.

“ What has chiefly determined the Conference upon this occasion is, that, founding its decisions upon equity, and considering the amount of the charges for the service of the public debt of the united kingdom of the Netherlands, it finds that the amount is stated in round numbers at 27,700,000 florins of rente, and that, in consequence, Belgium, during the union, contributed to the payment of this rente in the proportion of 16-31—that is to say, that instead of 14,000,000 florins, it will now, with the advantages

of neutrality, have to pay only for its part, 8,400,000 florins of rente, and on the other hand, in consequence of the mode of division adopted by the Conference, Holland obtains a considerable relief which may serve to satisfy the various claims which it has set up.

(Signed) “ ESTERHAZY.

“ WESSENBERG.

“ TALLEYRAND.

“ PALMERSTON.

“ BULOW.

“ LIEVEN.

“ MATUSCEWITSCH.”

---

ARTICLES of a definitive TREATY  
between HOLLAND and BEL-  
GIUM, agreed on by the CONFER-  
ENCE of LONDON, OCTOBER,  
1831.

“ The undersigned plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, after having maturely weighed all the considerations which have been made to them by the Belgian plenipotentiary upon the means of concluding a definitive treaty relative to the separation between Belgium and Holland have experienced the regret of finding that there is in these communications no approximation of the views and opinions of the parties directly interested.

“ Being unable to abandon to more protracted uncertainty questions of which the immediate solution has become necessary to Europe—forced to resolve them under pain of seeing them produce the incalculable evil of a general war—perfectly informed, moreover, respecting all the points in discussion by the communications which have been made to them by the Belgian plenipotentiary, and the plenipotentiaries of the Nether-



lands, the undersigned have but submitted to a duty which their Courts have to discharge, as well towards themselves as towards the other states, and which all attempts at direct conciliation between Belgium and Holland have still left unaccomplished — they have only caused to be respected the supreme law of an European interest of the first order—they have only caused a cessation of resistance to a necessity which had become more and more imperious—when they fixed the conditions of a definitive agreement which Europe, friendly to peace, and having a right to exact the preservation of peace, has sought for in vain, during the space of a year, on the propositions made by the two parties, or accepted in turn by one of them and rejected by the other.

“ In the condition which the twenty-four articles hereunto annexed contain, the Conference of London has been obliged to have regard only to the principles of equity. It has followed the impression of the strong desire which animated it, of conciliating interests with rights, and of securing to Holland as well as to Belgium, reciprocal advantages, good frontiers, a state of territorial possession without dispute, a liberty of commerce mutually beneficial, and a partition of debt which has been regulated less by minute calculations (the materials for which, indeed, have not been furnished), less also by the strictness of conventions and treaties, than with the view of lessening the burthens and of favouring the prosperity of the states.

“ In inviting the Belgian plenipotentiary to sign the article of which mention has been made above, the undersigned will observe,

“ 1. That these articles shall have all the force and value of a solemn convention between the Belgian government and the five Powers.

“ 2. That the five powers guarantee the execution of them.

“ 3. That, once accepted by the two parties, they are destined to be inserted, word for word, in a direct treaty between Belgium and Holland, which shall, in addition to them, contain only stipulations relative to the peace and friendship which shall subsist between the two countries and their sovereigns.

“ 4. That this treaty, signed under the auspices of the Conference of London, shall be placed under the formal guarantee of the five Powers.

“ 5. That the articles in question form a whole, and do not admit of any separation.

“ 6. Lastly, that they contain the final and irrevocable decisions of the five Powers, who, of common accord, are resolved themselves to bring about the full and entire acceptance of the said articles by the party adverse to them, if the party should reject them.

“ The undersigned embrace this opportunity of offering to the Belgian plenipotentiary the assurance of their most high consideration.

(Signed) “ ESTERHAZY.

“ TALLEYRAND.

“ BULOW.

“ MATUSCEWITSCH.

“ WESSENBERG.

“ PALMERSTON.

“ LIEVEN.”

“ 1. The Belgic territory, by this article, is to be composed of the provinces of South Brabant, Liege, Namur, Hainault, Western



Flanders, Eastern Flanders, Antwerp, and Limburg, as made part of the kingdom of the Netherlands in 1815, with the exception of the districts of the prince of Limburg pointed out by article 4.

“ 2. The Belgic territory will comprise, besides the part of the grand duchy of Luxemburg indicated in article 3.

“ 3. His majesty the king of the Netherlands, grand duke of Luxemburg, consents, that in the grand duchy of Luxemburg the limits of the Belgic territory shall be such as they are hereafter described.

[The remainder of the article traces the line of frontier.]

“ 4. His majesty the king of the Netherlands, grand duke of Luxemburg, shall receive, for the cessions made in the preceding article, a territorial indemnity in the province of Limburg.

[The article then points out the limits of this indemnity,]

“ 5. This article stipulates for the arrangement of the ceded territory with the Germanic Confederation.

“ 6. Pending these territorial arrangements, the parties are to resign for ever all pretension to the ceded parts, and commissioners from Belgium and Holland are to assemble as soon as possible in Maestricht, to mark out the boundaries.

“ 7. Belgium, in the limits pointed out by these articles, will form an independent and perpetually neutral state.

“ 8, 9, and 10. These articles regulate the navigation of the rivers of Flanders, of the Scheldt, and of the canals which traverse both countries, on a system of perfect equality.

“ 11. Leaves free commercial

communication by Maestricht and Sittard.

“ 12. Regulates the continuation of all new canals henceforward made.

“ 13. From the 1st of January, 1832, Belgium is to be charged a debt of 8,400,000 florins of annual rentes; and the article regulates the transfer of the capital which is henceforward to form a portion of the Belgic national debt.

“ 14. Regulates the payment of the expenses incurred by Holland since November 1, 1830, which Belgium is to reimburse in three instalments—on the 1st of January, the 1st of April, and the 1st of July, 1832.

“ 16. Refers to public works, as canals, roads, &c., which are to belong to the country in which they are situated.

“ 18, 19, 20. The inhabitants of both countries are to be allowed two years to dispose of their property, &c., if inclined to transfer their domicile from one country to the other.

“ 21. A general amnesty for past political occurrences.

“ 22. All pensions and salaries to be discharged according to the laws in force before November 1, 1830.

“ 23. All claims to be examined by a mixed commission of liquidation.

“ 24. Immediately after the exchange of the treaty of intervention between the two parties, the necessary orders shall be sent to the commanders of the respective armies for the evacuation of the territories, cities, towns, and places, which change domination. The civil authorities in them will at the same time receive the necessary orders for the surrender of their territories, cities, towns, and places,



to the commissioners who shall be appointed for that effect on one part and the other. This evacuation and surrender shall be so effected, that they may be completed within fifteen days, or sooner if it can be done.

(Signed) "ESTERHAZY.  
 "WESSENBERG.  
 "TALLEYRAND.  
 "PALMERSTON.  
 "BULOW.  
 "LIEVEN.  
 "MATUSCEWITSCH."

*Letter accompanying the Treaty.*

"The undersigned plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, after having communicated to the Belgian plenipotentiary the twenty-four articles annexed to their note of this day, and after having declared that these articles formed the final and irrevocable decision of the Conference of London, have still an obligation to fulfil towards the plenipotentiary, and they will do so with a frankness, the motives of which cannot fail to be appreciated.

"The five Courts reserving the task, and taking on themselves the engagement to obtain the assent of Holland to the articles in question, even though it should begin by rejecting them, guaranteeing besides their execution, and convinced that these articles, founded on principles of incontestable equity, offers to Belgium all the advantages which it has a right to claim, cannot omit to declare here their firm determination to oppose by all means in their power the renewal of a contest which, having now no object, would be the source of great disasters to the two countries, and would threaten Europe with a general war, which it is the

paramount duty of the five Powers to prevent. But the more calculated this determination is to make Belgium easy with respect to its future situation, and the circumstances which now cause lively alarm there, the more will it authorize the five Powers equally to employ all means in their power to obtain the assent of Belgium to the above-mentioned articles, if, contrary to all expectation, it should refuse them.

"The undersigned offer, &c.  
 "London, October, 1831."

(Signed as before.)

---

ANSWER of the BELGIAN PLENI-  
 POTENTIARY.

"The undersigned plenipotentiary of his majesty the king of the Belgians hastens to acknowledge to their excellencies the plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, the receipt—1st, of the twenty-four articles drawn up and resolved upon by the Conference at London; 2nd, of the two notes accompanying the twenty-four articles, and in which, after having explained its motives, its views, and its principles, the Conference invites the undersigned to sign the project of a definitive treaty sent to him.

"However ardent the desire of the undersigned for the speedy realization of the views of the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts for the preservation of general peace, it is his duty to declare, that the twenty-four articles in question differ too much from the instructions which he has received from his government, and the preliminaries which served as the basis of these instructions, for the undersigned to affix his signature



to the twenty-four articles. In consequence he has the honour to inform their excellencies, that he will transmit without delay the twenty-four articles, and the two notes to his majesty the king of the Belgians, and that he will wait for his sovereign decision.

“The undersigned begs their excellencies to accept, &c.

(Signed)

“SILVAIN VAN DE WEYER.

“*London, October 15.*”

---

NOTE of the DUTCH GOVERNMENT *rejecting the proposed TREATY*, 14th DECEMBER, 1831.

To Messrs. the plenipotentiaries of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, assembled in Conference at London.

“Their excellencies the plenipotentiaries of the Courts of Austria, France, Great Britain, Prussia, and Russia, assembled in Conference at London, have observed by the note with which they have honoured the undersigned plenipotentiaries of his majesty the king of the Netherlands, dated November 10, that the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle, in providing that in the case where a Congress of sovereigns or of plenipotentiaries shall have for its object matters specially connected with the interests of the other states of Europe, it shall only take place under the express reservation of their right of participation, directly or by their plenipotentiaries, does not prescribe the form of this participation, and has, consequently, left to the Conference at London a full liberty with respect to the mode of its communication with the undersigned, and to its assembling for the transac-

tion of business. According to the said note, the Conference of London, availing itself of this latitude, has called upon the undersigned to declare in writing the demands of their government, and to reply, likewise in writing, to the demands and observations of the adverse party, without ever refusing, moreover, the means of making known their opinions respecting all the points, the adjustment of which was in question. The Court of the Netherlands congratulates itself the more sincerely, in perceiving that the Conference at London has approved of the appeal made to the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle, that the participation of all the parties to the meetings, in which their interests are involved, should be reserved in the most precise manner. This was realized in the early period of the negotiation. From the commencement of the operations of the Conference of London, the protocol of the 4th of November, 1830, stated that the king of the Netherlands, having invited the five Courts to deliberate, in concert with his majesty, on the best means of putting a stop to the troubles which had broken out in his states, the five Powers, in the terms of the 4th section of their Protocol, signed at Aix-la-Chapelle, on the 15th of November, 1818, invited the ambassador of the king to take part in their deliberations. The latter, in consequence, took his proper place in the Conference. After a few meetings, however, the Conference no longer gave him notice of their meetings, and contented itself, thenceforward, with admitting, from time to time, the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands to receive explanations from them, or



to accept their written communications. The government of the Netherlands could not acknowledge that the exposition of its demands in writing,—the reply, in writing, to the demands and observations of the adverse party, and certain isolated explanations,—were equivalent to meetings, to the direct participation intimated by the protocol of Aix-la-Chapelle, seeing that a personal and regular discussion once dispensed with, the negotiation would lose its natural character, and that various objects must be imperfectly explained. The course taken in this respect by the Conference, can in no manner prejudice the right of the plenipotentiaries of the king to be present at its sittings. With respect to the means which the plenipotentiaries of the Netherlands have had to make known their opinions respecting all the points in dispute, this power did not exceed the limit of a consultative voice (*voix consultative*), and topics previously agitated, and of which the undersigned were in possession, and which had already taken place in the course of the negotiations. It lost its application with reference to objects equally serious and unexpected, which had not been once under discussion, which it was impossible to foresee would come under consideration, and respecting which the plenipotentiaries of the king were never consulted, of which the 24 articles communicated by their excellencies to the undersigned contained several, particularly the articles 9, 11, 12, and the 5th section of article 13.

“The undersigned avow, with the frankness due to the Conference, that they have sought in vain to reconcile with the protocol of Aix-

la-Chapelle the total absence of the first principles of the code of nations, in certain clauses which the 24 articles have produced for the first time, and which involve nothing less than dividing with foreigners the superintendence of the rights of navigation upon one of the rivers of Holland, the fixing the navigation duties on this river in common with another state, the exercising the right of fishing by foreign subjects, and confirming to the Dutch, as if it were a doubtful thing, the right of navigation in their own rivers, conformably to the reciprocity of navigation of the rivers between the Scheldt and the Rhine—rivers which exist only in the Dutch territory; to confer on foreigners the power of making a road, or cutting a canal, in the territory of the state; to interdict, without any pretence, all restraint in commercial intercourse through one of the first strong places in the kingdom (Maestricht), and to fix a liquidation, from which there could result no charge to the adverse party.

“With respect to the power of resuming hostilities, this question falls into the category of most negotiations, pending which, so long as they have not reached their termination, the parties would incur the risk of compromising themselves, by contracting positive engagements for uncertain future. The king, whilst he reserves to himself the right of recommencing hostilities eventually, does no more than maintain his natural position in the hope of an arrangement, and exercise an incontestible right. With special reference to the 24 articles, the undersigned beg leave to repeat, that for assuring to Holland the advantages which it possessed, they not only do not offer



her any which she did not possess before, but they impose on her, by the single condition that a country with which she has been united should separate from her, servile obligations in favour of this country, to which neither Holland nor any other independent state was ever subjected, and for which there can exist no equivalent whatever. They even take from her rights and advantages which she enjoyed at a period anterior to those of 1790, at which period existed the closing of the Scheldt, and that of 1815, when she gave up colonies and capitals for an union with Belgium—colonies and capitals which Holland would have a right to reclaim, and of which she would remain deprived, according to the 24 articles, without any compensation whatsoever.

“No opposition would be made on the part of Holland to an arrangement which should restore her to the position in which she stood in 1790 or 1815; but the 24 articles, far from offering such results, leave Holland, at the most, an honorary post in the European association.

“In providing good frontiers for Holland, it would seem that the royal crown of that country has been confounded with the grand ducal crown of Luxemburg, united at present in the head of the same prince, and subject to the chances of a future separation. It is, moreover, as little allowable to identify these two crowns as those of Great Britain and Hanover, and to impute to Holland as a favour the arrangements concerning the grand duchy of Luxemburg, as to carry to the account of England a treaty concluded by the Hanoverian government. To adopt an opposite principle, would be to place the

king-grand-duke in a false position towards Holland, the grand duchy of Luxemburg, and the Germanic Confederation, with the collateral branches of his own house. It is, moreover, evident that according to the 24 articles, the grand duke of Luxemburg himself will receive only a partial indemnity for the cession demanded of him of the greater part of his estates, and that Holland will lose her boundaries on the left bank of the Meuse and in the province of Liege, for no other advantage than that of seeing the territory separating the boundaries which remain to her in the hands of the grand duke of Luxemburg.

“By their vote of the 12th of November, their excellencies the plenipotentiaries of the five Courts have been pleased to advertise the undersigned, that the 24 articles had been accepted in Belgium. On the 14th the undersigned had the honour of stating, that if Belgium, contrary to the principles recognized in the 19th protocol, thus obtained a premature recognition, the king, by this fact alone, and independently of his rights of sovereignty, would be obliged not to accept the arrangements of separation on any other terms than saving the conditions and reservations which the high position and interests of Holland should at once dictate. The following day a formal treaty was concluded between their excellencies and the Belgic plenipotentiary prejudicial to the rights of the king, those of Holland, and of the grand duchy of Luxemburg, and injurious to those of the Germanic Confederation, agreeably to which none of its members can be dispossessed of his territory without his consent.



“The undersigned have received orders to protest, in the most formal manner, as they do by these presents, against the said treaty, essentially opposed to the appendix A of the 12th protocol, and the 19th protocol, which fixed the position of the king with respect to the five Powers.

“Reverting to the commencement of the present negotiation, it appears that the eight articles of the 21st of July, 1814, contain the principal features of the union between Holland and Belgium, and of the system of interior policy which was the consequence of it. By the acceptance of the king, they became obligations as the basis of the conditions of the union of Belgium to Holland under his sovereignty. Now that it is proposed to dissolve this union, the dissolution can only be effected in the same way—namely, by a negotiation with his majesty. Such was the principle of the existing negotiations in London; and when the separation had been decided, it was perceived that it was necessary to modify the eight articles of 1814 by the substitution of others according to circumstances. The appendix A to the 12th protocol, became the second basis of the negotiation, from the moment in which the acceptance of the king gave to this act the character of a bi-lateral engagement, between his majesty and the five Powers.

“The 18 articles presented more recently as preliminaries were, on the contrary, only propositions, in nowise obligatory on the Conference so long as the two parties had not accepted them. Holland having declined them, these articles left no trace behind them.

“In this state of things, the two bases above-mentioned must have guided the king's government in the examination of the 24 articles now proposed. The results of this examination are set forth in the memoir appended to the present note. They are conformable to the appendix A, in the 12th protocol. With regard to the form, the undersigned accept with eagerness that proposed by the Conference of a convention with the five Powers. If after the memoir above referred to, certain matters mentioned in the 24 articles, but foreign to the separation, and to the appendix A, be passed over in silence in the treaty, nothing need prevent their being discussed at a period more or less remote, and in the mean time there would be no obstacle to an immediate disarming of the two parties, which by putting a stop to the chance of a renewal of hostilities would contribute in an effectual manner to consolidate the maintenance of general peace.

“The cabinet of the Hague, seeking to remove difficulties which present themselves, has applied itself to obviate them, without producing any injury to the true interests of Belgium. It believes it has found a satisfactory solution in the present communication, and persuades itself that the two nations will unite in concerting together at a future period, a common understanding with respect to their mutual wants.

“The undersigned request that the plenipotentiaries of the five Powers assembled in Conference in London, will be pleased to take the present note and the memoir which accompanies it, into their examination. They flatter themselves that their excellencies will receive them with favour, and that



they will experience from them the same spirit of conciliation which has constantly directed the course of the government of the Netherlands. The sacrifices which the king consents to make, but which, in no case, can lead to anything, if the accompanying observations be not adopted, and the moderation which characterizes the present overtures, will doubtless contribute more and more to convince the five Powers represented at the Conference of London and Europe at large, of the sincere desire entertained by the government of the

Netherlands to smooth as much as possible the obstacles which have hitherto impeded the conclusion of a treaty with the five Courts destined to regulate the separation between Holland and Belgium, and to repel only those concessions which are incompatible with the independence, the dignity, and the primary interests of Holland.

“The undersigned subscribe themselves, &c.

“FALCK.

“H. DE ZUYLEN.

“DE NYEVELT.

“*London, 14th December.*”

---

SPEECH of KING LEOPOLD, on opening the BELGIC CONGRESS,  
SEPTEMBER 8, 1831.

“Gentlemen,—I am happy to be for the second time amidst the representatives of the nation.

“The proofs of affection and devotedness which the Belgic nation has not ceased to give me from the moment that I set my foot on the territory of my adopted country, have filled my heart with a lively gratitude. This voluntary transport of a whole nation, while it inspires me with very allowable pride, has made me sensible of the full extent of the duties that are imposed on me. I do not dissemble to myself any of the numerous difficulties of my situation, but, with the aid of your knowledge and experience, I shall be able to overcome them.

“When the principles laid down in the constitution which I have sworn to observe shall have received, by the projects of law which will be submitted to your consideration, the developement which they still require, Belgium will enjoy a greater degree of liberty

than any other nation in Europe. The crisis through which the country has had to pass, in order to attain its political regeneration, has for a moment affected its material interest. It must henceforth be the object of our united efforts to promote its interest by encouraging manufactures, and opening new channels to commerce.

“The relations already so happily established with France and England, which I hope will soon be extended to the other Powers, will facilitate the performance of this task.

“Negotiations have just been opened to effect a definitive arrangement of our differences with Holland. The honour and interests of the Belgian nation will be defended in them with perseverance and dignity. With you gentlemen, and the whole nation, I look with confidence to the issue of those negotiations, the result of which will be laid before you.

“The neutrality of Belgium,



guaranteed by the five Powers, has suggested the possibility of modifications in its system of defence. This possibility, the principle of which is admitted by the Powers concerned in the erection of the fortresses of 1815, will, I doubt not, be acknowledged by the nation. Negotiations will take place to regulate the execution of the measures connected with the demolition of some of those fortresses. Happy in being able to draw closer the ties which unite the two people, Belgium will on this occasion give a proof of its gratitude to France, and Europe a striking pledge of its just confidence in the honour of the king of the French.

“The eminent services rendered by France involuntarily call our attention to a recent event, the consequences of which, I must say, have been too much exaggerated. Belgium, confiding to excess in the engagements contracted by Holland towards the five Powers, and to which it had itself subscribed was suddenly surprised by an army, the force of which far exceeded that which Belgium could oppose to it.

“In these painful circumstances the succour of friendly Powers became urgent and indispensable. You know with what generous promptness it was afforded us. If individual courage, if the bravery which has never been denied the Belgic soldier, could have made up for the want of organization and union which was felt in our young army, without doubt (and you will believe my testimony) we should have victoriously repulsed an unjust aggression, contrary to all the principles of the law of nations. The nation will be but the more sensible of the absolute necessity of the re-

forms already commenced, and which are prosecuted with a degree of activity, the result of which will soon be apparent. In a few days Belgium will have an army, which, if it should be again necessary, would be able to rally round its king, to defend with honour and with success the independence and the rights of the country.

“Projects of law will be laid before you during this session to give to the government its legitimate share of influence in the composition of the army, to restore confidence to the soldiers and to secure a just recompence to those who shall distinguish themselves in the day of danger.

“Gentlemen—I will call your particular attention to the state of our finances. I know the care which that essential part of the public service requires. The prevailing desire of my government will always be successively to introduce in the public expenditure the economy which is so loudly called for by the state of society, and by the aid of which it will be practicable gradually to lessen the burthens of the people.

“At present, nevertheless, sacrifices are still necessary, on the one hand, to defray the expenses of the reorganization of the army; on the other to make up for a diminution in the revenues, which the circumstances in which we are for a time placed indicate as inevitable. The nation has proved that it did not shrink from the sacrifices which the honour and the interest of the country required. It will also know how to bear those of which the government shall have proved the necessity.

“The confidence with which the whole nation has hitherto met its king, gives me a right to reckon



on its representatives in all the measures which may contribute to the good of the country. My hopes will not be disappointed. Belgium will see us animated by the same desires to labour in con-

cert for the happiness and glory of this country, to which I shall not cease to devote all my solicitude, as I have already devoted to it my dearest affections."

---

SPEECH of the KING of HOLLAND, on opening the SESSIONS of the STATES GENERAL, OCTOBER 17.

"High and Mighty Lords,

"The difficult circumstances in which the country has for more than a year been placed have prolonged your last Session until the present, which I now open.

"In the course of that year you have been informed of the progress of the events and negotiations occasioned by the armed insurrection of Belgium. Your high mightinesses must have been convinced that the constant efforts of the government, during the whole of that period, to terminate on advantageous conditions the painful state of necessity in which the faithful Netherlands were placed, of making extraordinary efforts, have been fruitless.

"However, to the sacrifices occasioned by this state of things had been added an energy which opens for the nation a consolatory perspective. The country has given to Europe a brilliant example of unalterable attachment to the principles of religion and social order. She has shown a firm determination to maintain herself in that position, and this determination must have an advantageous influence on her consideration among the Powers, and on the decision of her future fate.

"The volunteers, civic guard, and militia, have in courage and

perseverance been rivals of the regular land and sea forces. Seconded by the enthusiasm which animates all my subjects, their efforts have sufficed, not only to protect the country, but even to attack, on his own territory, an enemy of nearly double our population, to conquer him, and drive him back into the heart of his country, leaving him no other means of safety except that of calling foreign phalanxes to his aid.

"Our mind is still deeply impressed with all the proofs of fidelity and intrepidity given by the defenders of the state, and of all the heroic deeds which have shone forth with so much lustre. A grateful posterity will keep them in recollection.

"In consequence of this spirit, it has not been necessary to have recourse to the *levy en masse*, prepared at the commencement of your last Session. From those liable to be called out, nothing more is required than a local service, similar to that which they already perform in several towns, conjointly with the volunteers of all classes; and to which they have devoted themselves with the most praiseworthy zeal.

"Nevertheless, no pains have been spared to obtain an honourable peace; but we are prepared



for a new war, if the hope of a prompt and equitable arrangement should not yet be realized.

“ To this end have been ordered an extraordinary levy of the national militia, and the rendering disposable the first van of the civic guard for the present year. Meanwhile the students of the universities and Athenæum, who hastened with so much courage to the armies, but who have now resumed their studies, are prepared to resume the sword, whenever the honour and defence of the country may require their aid.

“ Amidst the evils so unmerited which afflict the country, the relations of amity with other powers are maintained and extended. The difficulties which for many years have prevented the navigation of the Rhine from being regulated, are removed by a convention, concluded with States bordering on that river ; and this convention is now in force.

“ It is agreeable to me, to be able to announce to your high mightinesses, that the state of agriculture presents this year more satisfactory results than it has done for several preceding years. The harvest has been favourable beyond expectation.

“ While other countries are afflicted with a prevailing and spreading malady, the Netherlands, thanks to Providence, has hitherto been spared. At the end of last year, the necessary measures were adopted for preventing the introduction of the disease by nautical communication. Aided by the information of men of science, the means most proper for averting this scourge, and for diminishing its intensity if it should reach us, are under investigation and in preparation.

“ Commerce, navigation, and all the branches of human industry therewith connected, have generally suffered ; and, consequently, that suffering has also been felt in this kingdom through the obstacles which communications have experienced from the uncertainty occasioned by political commotions and other circumstances. This additional evil, though heavy, is, in its nature, temporary, and cannot have a permanent influence on our relations.

“ The canal cut through the island of Voone has this year been opened for the passage of vessels, and the undertaking completely answers the expectations which were formed of its success.

“ The draught of a new law, and of a tariff of import, export, and transit duties, is at present the subject of serious deliberation, in order to its being finally submitted to your high mightinesses. This law, I am convinced, will best contribute to the welfare of the old Netherlands, by being made to combine an entire liberty for foreign trade with due protection to our flag, our agriculture, and our domestic industry.

“ The internal tranquillity which has fortunately been restored in our East-India possessions adds a favourable influence to the efforts constantly employed for re-establishing the finances of those countries. Your high mightinesses will obtain proofs of this by communications which will be made on the subject during the present Session.

“ In the West-India colonies industry is still fettered, but the means of removing its embarrassments form the object of our particular attention.

“ Notwithstanding the difficult position in which we are placed by



the Belgic insurrection, the finances of the state have suffered no confusion. The co-operation and perseverance of my faithful countrymen have rendered it possible to fulfil all engagements. The interest of the public debt, and the great expenses of the navy and army, have consequently been paid regularly, and without any delay.

“In the preparation of laws relative to the expenses of the incoming year, and the means of meeting the same, I have endeavoured to cause to be observed the severest economy as to the former, and the alleviation as far as possible of the burthens which the expenditure may occasion.

“The situation of the kingdom requires great sacrifices, but I shall propose them with confidence to your high mightinesses, convinced as I am that it is the unanimous determination of my beloved people to prove by every means to our friends and to our enemies, that whatever trials Providence may reserve for us, we can not only pro-

vide for the wants of the country, but also maintain those principles on which the honour, the liberty, and the existence of the people of the old Netherlands repose, and thereby cause to be respected the national credit and independence.

“I have found it necessary to submit to a revision the code already adopted, together with the law on the judicial organization, in order that the same may be made to coincide better with the interests of the old Netherlands. I hope to be able to present to you during the present session a part of this important operation.

“High and mighty lords,—Our future is still covered with a veil, but with confidence in the wisdom and bounty of the Almighty we await the decision of our lot; for our cause is just, and all our people religiously persevere in the unanimous resolution to sacrifice their property and their blood for the maintenance of our beloved country.”

---

#### MANIFESTO of the POLISH ESTATES, JANUARY, 1831.

“When a nation, formerly free and powerful, finds itself compelled by the excess of its ills to have recourse to the last of its rights—to the right of repelling oppression by force—it owes to itself, and to the rest of the world, to divulge the motives which have induced it to sustain by arms the most holy of causes. The Chambers of the Diet have felt this necessity, and, following the spirit of the revolution of the 29th of November, and acknowledging it to be national, they have resolved to justify themselves in the eyes of Europe.

“The infamous machinations, the vile calumnies, the open violence, and the secret treachery which accompanied the three dismemberments of ancient Poland, are but too well known; history has already branded them as a political crime. The deep and awful mourning which this violation spread throughout the country has never been laid aside, but has been religiously preserved even until now; the unspotted standard has never ceased to wave at the head of our valiant army; and, in all his military migrations, the Pole,



carrying from country to country his household gods, has cried out for vengeance for the outrages committed against them. Cherishing that noble illusion, which, like every other grand idea, has never failed in the end to be realized, he believed that whenever he fought for the cause of liberty he was fighting for his own country. This country at length re-established her existence; and although restrained within narrow limits, Poland received from the Great Warrior of the age her native language, her rights and liberties—precious gifts again augmented by the greatest of hopes. From that moment his cause became ours—our blood became his right; and when his allies and Heaven itself abandoned him, the Poles, preserving their fidelity, participated in the disasters of the hero, and the common fall of the Great Man and an unfortunate nation drew involuntary tears from the conqueror himself.

“ This sentiment had produced too strong an impression. The sovereigns of Europe, in the midst of the combat, had promised to give durable peace to the world with too much solemnity, not to admit that the Congress of Vienna, upon their again dividing our country amongst them as spoil, should in some degree soften the fresh outrages committed against the Poles. A nationality and a reciprocal freedom of commerce was guaranteed to every part of ancient Poland; and that which the great European conflict had found independent, parcelled out on three sides, received the title of kingdom, and was placed under the immediate dominion of the Emperor Alexander, with a separate charter, and the power of being enlarged.

“ In execution of these stipulations he granted a free constitution to the kingdom, and gave to the Poles, subject to the domination of Russia, a gleam of hope that they might shortly be united to their brethren. These gifts, however, were not gratuitous; he had previously contracted obligations towards us, and we, on our part, had made sacrifices in return. Before and during the decisive struggle, the brilliant promises made to the Poles who were subject to the sceptre of Alexander, and the suspicions raised with respect to the intentions of Napoleon, prevented more than one Pole from declaring in his favour. The Emperor of Russia was only faithful to his promises in declaring himself king of Poland, but as to that nationality, those liberties which were to become the guarantees of the peace of Europe, we were forced to purchase them at the price of our independence, that first condition of the political existence of nations, as if a durable peace could be established upon the enslavement of 16,000,000 of people—as if the annals of the world had not taught us that, even after an interval of ages, nations reduced to foreign subjection always recovered that independence which had been destined for them by the Creator from the beginning of time, by having separated them from other nations in language and customs—as if this lesson was forgotten by governments, that people oppressed ever become the natural allies of whoever may happen to rise up against their oppressors.

“ But these conditions, though arbitrarily imposed, were not fulfilled: it was not long before the Poles became convinced that the nationality and the title of



kingdom, given to Poland by the emperor of Russia, were but a lure to their brethren, subject to other States—but a weapon against those same States—and but a mere chimera to those to whom they had been guaranteed. They became convinced that, under the shelter of these sacred names, it was intended to reduce them to a servile degradation, and weigh them down by all the inflictions of a continued despotism, and the loss of the dignity appertaining to man. The measures taken against the army first drew aside the veil that covered this mysterious plan. The most cruel outrages—the most infamous punishments—the most refined persecutions ordered by the commander-in-chief, under the pretence of maintaining discipline, but the real object of which was to destroy that feeling of honour, that national dignity, which characterised our troops, were invented and enforced. Faults the most trifling were deemed and treated as most serious offences—the slightest suspicion converted into proofs of breach of discipline—and the commander-in-chief, by his arbitrary control over the courts-martial, rendered in fact the sole arbiter of the life and honour of each individual soldier. The nation beheld with indignation the decrees of these courts repeatedly quashed, until at length their decisions attained the degree of severity that was required from them. Many members, in consequence, sent in their resignation: many, personally insulted by the commander-in-chief, purified by their own blood the outrages that had been committed upon them, and, at the same time, showed that it was not the want of true courage, but the fear of compromising

the future fate of their country, that withheld their arms from falling in vengeance upon their oppressors.

“On the meeting of the first Diet of the kingdom, a renewal of the solemn promises that the blessings of a constitution should be extended to our brethren, who were to be re-united to us, revived extinguished hopes, and caused the moderation to reign in the Chambers which was their only end and object. The freedom of the press, and the publicity of the proceedings of the Diet, were only tolerated in so far as they gave vent to the hymns and praises of a subjugated people in honour of their all-powerful conqueror; but when, after that Diet was closed, the public journals continued to discuss public affairs, a severe censorship was introduced; and on the meeting of the following Diet, which proposed to itself the same object as the former, the representatives of the people were persecuted for the opinions they delivered in the Chambers. The constitutional states of Europe will be astonished when they learn what has been so carefully concealed from them,—when, on the one hand, they behold the wise and moderate use the Poles have made of their liberty, the veneration they have shown for their sovereign, his religion and customs uniformly treated with respect; and on the other, the bad faith with which power has been used, not content with despoiling an unhappy people of their rights, but imputing the horror of these violations to the unbridled exercise of their freedom.

“The placing in union upon one head the crowns of an Autocrat and of a constitutional king was



one of those political monstrosities which are never of long duration. Every man foresaw that the kingdom of Poland must become either the nursery of liberal institutions for Russia, or sink under the iron hand of its despotism. This question was soon resolved. It appears that at one moment the emperor Alexander conceived that he might consolidate his arbitrary power with our liberal laws, and thereby secure for himself a new influence over the affairs of Europe. But he was soon convinced that liberty could never become so debased as to be the blind instrument of despotism; and from that time, instead of her defender, he became her persecutor. Russia lost all hope of ever seeing the yoke by which she was oppressed taken off by the hand of her sovereign, and Poland saw herself successively deprived of all her privileges. No time was lost in carrying this design into execution. Public education was corrupted, a system of concealment and mystery was adopted, the people were left without means of instruction, a whole palatinate was deprived of its representation, and the Chambers no longer allowed the faculty of voting the supplies. New burthens were imposed, new monopolies created to dry up the sources of national wealth; and the treasury, enriched by these measures, became the pasture of salaried sycophants, infamous hireling instigators, and vile and despicable spies. Instead of the economy so repeatedly called for, pensions were augmented in a most scandalous degree, to which were added enormous gratuities, and offices created solely with the view of augmenting the number of the government satraps.

“Calumny and espionage were

carried into the secret circles of private families, and, the freedom of private life infected with their poison, the ancient hospitality of the Poles became a snare for their innocence. Individual liberty, which had been solemnly guaranteed, was violated, and the prisons of the state became crowded; councils of war were authorized to pronounce judgment in civil cases; and citizens, whose only fault was a wish to save the spirit and character of the nation from corruption, were subjected to infamous punishments. It was in vain that some of the authorities of the kingdom, and the representatives of the people, laid before the king a faithful picture of the abuses committed in his name, for not only were the abuses suffered to remain unsuppressed, but the responsibility of the ministers and the administrative authorities was paralysed, by the immediate interference of the brother of the emperor, and by the exercise of that discretionary power with which he was invested. This monstrous authority, the source of the greatest abuses, and which might wound the personal dignity of every individual, had become so infatuated, that it even dared to call before it citizens of every rank and condition, merely to load them with insults, and at times to subject them to disgraceful public labours, reserved for the vilest convicts; as if Providence, by permitting them to carry their outrages against the people to the very utmost pitch, had destined their inordinate abuses of authority to be the exciting cause of our insurrection.

“After so many affronts, after so manifest a violation of the guarantees sworn—a violation which no legitimate government in any



civilized country would have allowed itself with impunity, and which *a fortiori*, may justify our insurrection against an authority imposed by force—who will not consider that this authority has broken off all alliance with the nation, that it has oppressed it beneath the yoke of slavery, that it has given the right at every instant to burst its fetters and forge them into arms?

“The picture of the disasters of our brethren may be superfluous, but truth forbids us to pass it over. The provinces formerly incorporated with Russia have not been rennited to the kingdom. Our brethren have not been admitted to the enjoyment of the liberal institutions stipulated by the Congress of Vienna; on the contrary, the national recollections awakened in them, first by promises and encouragement, and then by a long expectation, became a crime against the state, and the king of Poland caused to be prosecuted, in the ancient provinces of that state, such Poles as had dared to call themselves Poles. The youth of the schools were particularly the objects of persecution; young children were torn from their mothers’ breasts; the issue of the first families were transported to Siberia, or were forced to enter into the ranks of a corrupt soldiery. In official documents and judicial examinations, the Polish language was suppressed; the Polish tribunals and civil law were annihilated by ukases; abuses of administration reduced the landed proprietors to misery; and since the accession of Nicholas to the throne, this state of things had constantly been growing worse. Religious intolerance itself employed every means to consolidate the united

Greek ritual upon the ruins of the Catholic ritual.

“In the kingdom, although none of the liberties guaranteed by the constitution were observed, these liberties, suppressed *de facto*, nevertheless continued to exist *de jure*. It was precisely this existence *de jure* that it was necessary to undermine. We then saw that additional article to the constitution appear, which setting forth a specious solicitude for the maintenance of the charter, destroyed one of its principal provisions by depriving the Chambers of the publicity of their proceedings and the support of public opinion, and which, above all, was to consecrate the principle that it was allowed to cut up at will the fundamental compact, and thereby entirely to abolish the charter, as one of its articles had been abolished. It was under these auspices that the Diet of 1825 was convoked, from which it was sought, by all manner of means, to discard the most intrepid defenders of our liberties; a Nuncio, who had just taken part in the deliberations, was carried off by main force, surrounded by gendarmes, and held captive for five years, till the moment when the revolution broke out. Deprived of its force, shut up, threatened with the loss of the charter, and misled by fresh promises of the ancient provinces being reunited to the kingdom, the Diet of 1825 followed the example of that of 1818; but these promises remained without effect, and the petitions which prayed for the restoration of our liberties were rejected.

“The general indignation of the well-disposed inhabitants, and the exasperation of the whole nation, had long been bringing on the storm, the approach of which



began to appear, when the death of Alexander, the accession of Nicholas to the throne, and the oath he took to maintain the constitution, seemed to promise us a cessation of abuses and the return of our liberties. This hope soon vanished; for not only did things continue as they were, but the revolution of St. Petersburg even served as a pretext to imprison and bring to trial the most distinguished individuals of the Senate, the chamber of Nuncios, the army, and the citizens. In a short time the prisons of the capital were filled. Every day fresh buildings were appropriated to receive thousands of victims sent to Warsaw from every part of Old Poland, and even from parts subject to foreign governments. Upon the native soil of liberty were introduced tortures which cause humanity to shudder. Death and suicide constantly diminished the number of the unfortunate victims, who were sometimes left forgotten in small and damp dungeons. In contempt of every law, a special committee of inquiry was instituted, composed of Russians and Poles, most of them military men, who, by protracted tortures, by promises of pardon and insidious questions, only sought to extort from the accused the confession of an imaginary crime. It was only after an imprisonment of one year and a half that the High National Court was established, for, as in spite of every law, imprisonments had been criminally prolonged to a degree that several victims had died in prison, it became absolutely necessary to render this measure legal. The conscience of the Senate disappointed this expectation, and the accused, who had been groaning in prison for two years, were ac-

quitted of any crime against the State. This decision, from that period, removed all distinctions between the accused and their judges. The former notwithstanding the sentence which proclaimed their innocence, instead of being set at liberty, were conveyed to St. Petersburg, where they were imprisoned in forts, and up to this moment several have not been restored to their families. The latter were detained for nearly a year at Warsaw, for having shown themselves independent judges. The publication and execution of the sentence were stopped. It was submitted to the examination of the administrative authorities, and when, at length, out of some regard for Europe, it was found necessary to publish it, a minister carried his audacity so far as to degrade the national majesty, by reprimanding, in the name of the sovereign the highest magistracy of the state, in the exercise of their most exalted functions.

“It was after such acts that the emperor Nicholas resolved to be crowned king of Poland. The representatives of the nation being summoned, were silent witnesses of this ceremony, and the new oaths were soon violated again, for no abuse was suppressed, not even the discretionary power. Even on the day of the coronation the senate was filled with new members, who did not possess the qualifications required by the constitution, the only guarantee of the independence of their votes. An illegal loan, and the alienation of national domains, were intended to render moveable and disposable the immense landed property of the state. But Providence directed that the large sums proceeding from the partial execution of this plan should



not be squandered away, but be used in arming the nation.

“In short, the last consolation which, under the reign of Alexander, enabled the Poles to support their misfortunes, — namely, the hope of seeing themselves reunited to their brethren, was taken from them by the emperor Nicholas. From that moment all ties were broken. The sacred fire which had long been prohibited from being kindled upon the altars of the country, was secretly burning in the hearts of all well-disposed men. One thought only was common to them—namely, that they should no longer endure such a slavery. But the government itself hastened the moment of explosion. In consequence of reports, daily corroborated, of a war against the liberty of nations, orders were given to put upon the war establishment the Polish army destined to march; and, in its place, the Russian armies were to occupy the country. Considerable sums proceeding from the loan and the sale of the national domains, deposited at the bank, were to cover the expenses of this deadly war against liberty. Arrests again took place; every moment was precious. Our army—our treasure—our resources—our national honour—averse to rivet chains upon the necks of other nations, and to fight against liberty and our former companions in arms, were at stake. Every one shared this feeling; but the heart of the nation—the focus of enthusiasm, the youth of the army and of the colleges, as well as a great part of the garrison of Warsaw, and of the citizens, impressed with this sentiment, resolved to give the signal for the insurrection. An electric spark in a moment inflamed the army, the capital, and the

whole country. The night of Nov. 29 was illuminated by the fire of liberty. In one day the capital was delivered; in a few days all the divisions of the army were united by the same sentiment, the fortresses occupied, the natives armed, the brother of the emperor, with the Russian troops, relying upon the generosity of the Poles, and owing his safety to this step alone. Such were the acts of this heroic noble revolution, which is as pure as the enthusiasm of the youth whose offspring it is.

“The Polish nation have risen from their abasement and degradation, with the firm resolution no longer to bend beneath the iron yoke which has just been broken, and not to lay down the arms of their ancestors until they have regained their independence and power, the only guarantee of their liberties: until after having secured the enjoyment of these liberties, which they claim upon a two-fold right—namely, as the honourable heritage of their forefathers, and as the urgent want of the age; and finally, until after being re-united to their brethren, subject to the yoke of the cabinet of St. Petersburg, and having delivered them, they shall have made them sharers of their liberties and independence. We have not been influenced by any national hatred against the Russians, with whom we have a common origin; on the contrary, at the first moment we felt pleasure, upon the loss of our independence, in thinking that, although our re-union under the same sceptre was injurious to our interests, yet it might cause a population of 40,000,000 to partake of the enjoyment of constitutional liberties, which, in the whole civilized world, had become equally



necessary both to nations and sovereigns.

“ Convinced that our liberty and independence, far from having been hostile to the neighbouring states, have, on the contrary, served at all times as an equilibrium and shield to Europe, and may now become more useful than ever, we appear in the presence of sovereigns and nations, with the assurance that the voice of policy and humanity will be equally heard in our favour.

“ If even in this struggle, the dangers of which we do not conceal from ourselves, we were to fight alone for the interest of all, full of confidence in the sanctity of our cause, in our own valour, and in the assistance of the Almighty, we will fight till our last gasp for liberty ; and if Providence has destined this land to perpetual slavery ; if in this last struggle the freedom of Poland is to fall beneath the ruins of its towns and the bodies of its defenders, our enemy shall only reign over deserts, and every good Pole, when dying, will carry with him the consolation, that if Heaven has not permitted him to save his own liberty and his own country, he has, at least, by this deadly combat, placed the liberties of threatened Europe under shelter for a moment.

The document is signed in the following manner :—

[The drawers up of the manifesto.]

(Signed) Prazinowski, bishop of Plock ; Miazynski, palatine senator ; Protocki, castellan senator ; W. Zurierchowski, deputy of Warsaw ; G. Malacowski, nuncio of the district of Szydtourée ; Swidzinski, (Constantine,) nuncio of Opoczno ; Biernacki (Aluis,) nuncio of the district of Wtelun ; Lelewel (Jochim,) nuncio of the district of Zelechow ; Malachowski, castellan senator.

The committee of the diet charged with giving its opinion as to the drawing up of the manifesto.

Signed—Prince Adam Czartoryski, palatine senator ; Prince Michel Radziwill, palatine senator ; Gliszczynski, castellan senator ; Kochanowski, castellan senator ; Wodzinski, castellan senator ; L. Pac, castellan senator ; the Count Ladislas Ostrowski, marshal of the Diet ; Count Jean Lepochowski, nuncio of the palatine of Cracow ; Francois Soltyk, nuncio of the palatinate of Sandomir ; Morawski (Theophilus), nuncio of Kalisz ; Swirski (Joseph), nuncio of the district of Hrubieszoco ; Ignatius Dembowski, nuncio of Plock ; Count Jezierski, Ignatius Wezyk, deputy of Losice ; J. Wisniewski.

Correct Copy.

The Marshal of the Diet,

(Signed) COUNT OSTROWSKI.

The Secretary of the Chamber of the Nuncios,

(Signed) XAVIER CZARNOCKI.

Deputy of the district of Slanislawow.

---

CIRCULAR of the POLISH GOVERNMENT to FOREIGN CABINETS,  
APRIL 30th.

“ Recent military events having freed the capital, and the whole of the right bank of the Vistula, from

the attacks of the enemy, I deem it a duty to request you to use every possible effort to convey to



the government to which you are accredited, the wishes of the Polish nation. It is a received principle in Europe, that the independent existence of every country is founded on those rights which have once been recognized, as well as in the formation of a domestic force capable of protecting and maintaining it. When the question of right is co-existent with that of fact, both yield to each other reciprocal support. The former existence of Poland, her relations with other states, are sufficiently known, nor can the three partitioning powers question their historical accuracy, for they must retain a recollection of the intimate relations which Poland formerly maintained with them, of the services that she rendered them, or of the reverses which she forced them to endure. If, then, we consult the history of our country, or that of Europe, it will be seen that the right of the Poles to a national and independent existence is incontestable. It is true that at the close of the last century the three partitioning powers, after having confederated for our ruin, destroyed that independence; but that act has been designated throughout the world as spoliation and political crime; that act could neither annihilate ancient rights nor create new ones. Thus, even after the success of the conspiracy of the three courts, the voice of Europe, in raising itself in favour of the rights of Poland, proclaimed them to be imprescriptible; but although they preserved their full vigour, they could no longer be exercised in the political world, invested with their external attributes.

“Recent events have changed this state of things. An insurrec-

tion, distinguished for its energy and exemption from every excess, has severed the bonds which connected Poland with Russia. The kingdom is now subject only to a national government, unanimously chosen by a diet, the members of which, it is worthy of remark, were all elected under the Russian government. That diet has intrusted the public affairs to persons the most eminent, both for birth and popularity, and whose political career affords the best guarantee to Europe. The diet has thus secured, in the strongest way possible, those monarchical institutions which the two Chambers have declared as best suited to the wishes and the wants of the nation. The national government of the kingdom encounters no opposition in the exercise of its authority; its orders are executed with the utmost zeal, in every part of the kingdom unoccupied by the enemy. The Polish troops, the armed representation of the opinions, of the desires, and of the power, of the nation, after three glorious, but deadly conflicts, after having sustained dreadful losses, have again completed their full numbers. Their confidence in their own resources has increased them, and that heroic army responds to the hopes that the national government reposes in them. We are now independent, in the strongest sense of the term, and the question of fact is no longer in opposition to the question of right. The dangers which may hereafter threaten us, and which to-morrow may threaten the liberty and the glory of other powers in Europe, cannot in any respect alter our real position, nor can they prevent us from proclaiming at this moment that we are independent.



It is, therefore, admissible for us to claim from other governments the recognition of our independence—to claim it in the name of the most sacred rights, which Europe has unanimously declared to be imperishable.

“If Belgium, which never ranked among states—if Greece, whose political existence has been annihilated for ages—have obtained, among all the uncertainty of war, the recognition of their independence, I ask if Poland has not stronger grounds for her pretensions; that Poland, whose national existence, extinguished for a moment, revives with so much vigour, sustains itself with so much energy, and at the price of so many sacrifices—that Poland, which, alone and without aid, has dared to combat with the giant of the North, and has already overthrown the illusion of his power. It would be vain, in discussing the question of Polish independence, to refer to the acts of the Congress of Vienna. The treaty of Vienna, when uniting the kingdom of Poland to Russia, assured to us a national individuality, and a constitutional government; it also aimed at extending this nationality to the Polish provinces incorporated in the Russian empire; and this for the purpose of consolidating the tranquillity of Europe.

“Such was the spirit of the treaty of Vienna. The emperor of Russia has been the first to violate that treaty by overthrowing in the kingdom the principal constitutional securities, in smothering all national spirit in the Polish provinces, in prohibiting even the use of our language. All our sufferings have been sufficiently exposed in the manifesto of the

diet. The treaty of Vienna has, then, been, both in its arrangements and their results, inadequate to the maintenance of peace. The violence of the Russian government has provoked an insurrection, which has been followed by decisive events. A new order of things has arisen. The chain which attached Poland to Russia has been broken, the bond which united Belgium with Holland has been severed, but a short time previously, although the treaty of Vienna had guaranteed their perpetuity. The European powers have, notwithstanding, recognized the independence of Belgium, adopting a noble and elevated policy. Why, then, animated by the same spirit, do they not interfere in our favour?

“‘The union of Belgium with Holland,’ says the protocol of London, of the 19th of February, ‘is broken. Official communications have convinced the five Courts that the means originally destined for its preservation can neither re-establish it at present, nor preserve it hereafter, and that henceforth, instead of confounding the affections and the welfare of the two people, it could only excite passions and hatred which, from their collision, could only produce war and all its disasters. It does not devolve on the powers to judge of the causes which have destroyed the ancient ties, but when they see these ties severed, it belongs to them to aim once more at the object which was proposed in their formation. It belongs to them to secure, in favour of the new combinations, that tranquillity to Europe, of which the union of Belgium with Holland formed an essential basis.’

“The cause of Belgium is iden-



tified with ours; and if there be any dissimilarity between the two, it is in our favour. Poland was formerly independent and powerful. The Congress of Vienna even contemplated the re-establishment of that independence, and of the integrity of the Polish territory; but as these views were counteracted by imperious circumstances, a new kingdom was created, the limits of which were small, and which was united to Russia. On every occasion the best intentions with regard to us were testified, by guaranteeing also the nationality of the other Polish provinces: the inadequacy of these dispositions towards Poland in general was clearly demonstrated—dispositions which may be considered as provisional. The kingdom to which the Congress of Vienna had guaranteed a constitution was united to the most powerful despotic state. This alliance was difficult to form; its duration was impossible, for it carried in itself the seeds of dissolution. It may be urged in opposition to this, that Russia, that power so redoubtable to all Europe, can, even after a desperate contest, reduce us to submission, and pacify, by exterminating us. The peace of slavery—the peace of the tomb—a peace of such a nature as to excite a terrible war on the first favourable opportunity—can such a peace meet the noble and dignified intentions of the European powers?

“I repeat it, every treaty is the consequence either of certain events, or of certain political combinations. If other events displace those that preceded them—if the combination be altered—the contracting parties must modify their engagements in accordance with the new combinations, for the purpose of upholding the principles which they had adopted, and for insuring the object which they had at first proposed. The Congress of Vienna could dispose of Belgium conquered by the allied powers, and of Poland occupied by the Russian armies. But Poland delivered—Poland which repels the numerous hordes of the aggressors—has a just right to claim admission into the great family of the independent nations of Europe, as Belgium has been there received, after having thrown off the yoke of Holland.

“Such are the principles that you will advance—such are the arguments you will employ to strengthen the demand you are authorized to make on the government to which you are accredited—the demand of the formal and positive recognition of the national government in the kingdom of Poland, and of the independence of that kingdom.

“THE SECRETARY OF STATE  
for Foreign Affairs,  
for the national government  
of the kingdom of Poland.”

---

MESSAGE from the PRESIDENT of the UNITED STATES to both HOUSES  
of CONGRESS, at the commencement of the First Session of the  
TWENTY-SECOND CONGRESS.

“Fellow Citizens of the Senate  
and House of Representatives,—  
VOL. LXXIII.

The representation of the people  
has been renewed for the twenty-  
2 E



second time since the constitution they formed has been in force. For near half a century, the chief magistrates who had been successively chosen have made their annual communications of the state of the nation by its representatives. Generally these communications have been of the most gratifying nature, testifying an advance in all the improvements of social, and all the securities of a political life. But frequently, and justly as you have been called on to be grateful for the bounties of Providence, at few periods have they been more abundantly or extensively bestowed than at the present; rarely, if ever, have we had greater reason to congratulate each other on the continued and increasing prosperity of our beloved country.

“Agriculture, the first and most important occupation of man, has compensated the labours of the husbandman with plentiful crops of all the varied products of our extensive country. Manufactures have been established, in which the funds of the capitalists find a profitable investment, and which give employment and subsistence to a numerous increasing body of industrious and dexterous mechanics. Labour is rewarded by high wages, in the construction of works of internal improvement, which are extending with unprecedented rapidity. Science is steadily penetrating the recesses of nature, and disclosing her secrets, while the ingenuity of free minds is subjecting the elements to the power of man, and making each new conquest auxiliary to his comfort. By our mails, whose speed is regularly increased, and whose routes are every year extended, the communication of public intelligence and private business is

rendered frequent and safe—the intercourse between distant cities, which formerly required weeks to accomplish, is now effected in a few days; and in the construction of railroads, and the application of steam power, we have a reasonable prospect that the extreme parts of our country will be so much approximated, and those most isolated by the obstacles of nature rendered so accessible as to remove an apprehension sometimes entertained, that the great extent of the Union would endanger its permanent existence.

“If, from the satisfactory view of our agriculture, manufactures, and internal improvements, we turn to the state of our navigation and trade with foreign nations and between the States, we shall scarcely find less cause for gratulation. A beneficent Providence has provided, for their exercise and encouragement, an extensive coast, indented by capacious bays, noble rivers, inland seas, with a country productive of every material for shipbuilding, and every commodity for gainful commerce, and filled with a population, active, intelligent, well-informed, and fearless of danger. These advantages are not neglected; and an impulse has lately been given to commercial enterprise, which fills our shipyards with new constructions, encourages all the arts and branches of industry connected with them, crowds the wharfs of our cities with vessels, and covers the most distant seas with our canvass.

“Let us be grateful for these blessings to the beneficent Being who has conferred them, and who suffers us to indulge a reasonable hope of their continuance and extension, while we neglect not the means by which they may be pre-



served. If we may dare to judge his future designs, by the manner in which his past favours have been bestowed, he has made our national prosperity to depend on the preservation of our liberties ; our national force on our federal union ; and our individual happiness on the maintenance of our state rights and wise institutions. If we are prosperous at home, and respected abroad, it is because we are free, united, industrious, and obedient to the laws. While we continue so, we shall, by the blessing of Heaven, go on in the happy career we have begun, and which has brought us, in the short period of our political existence, from a population of 3,000,000 to 13,000,000 ; from thirteen separate colonies to twenty-four United States—from weakness to strength—from a rank scarcely marked in the scale of nations to a high place in their respect.

“ This last advantage is one that has resulted, in a great degree, from the principles which have guided our intercourse with foreign Powers, since we have assumed an equal station among them : and hence, the annual account which the executive renders to the country, of the manner in which that branch of his duties has been fulfilled, proves instructive and salutary.

“ The pacific and wise policy of our government kept us in a state of neutrality during the wars that have, at different periods since our political existence, been carried on by other Powers ; but this policy, while it gave activity and extent to our commerce, exposed it in the same proportion to injuries from the belligerent nations. Hence have arisen claims of indemnity for those injuries. England, France,

Spain, Holland, Sweden, Denmark, Naples, and lately Portugal, had all, in a greater or less degree, infringed our neutral rights. Demands for reparation were made upon all. They have had in all, and continue to have, in some cases, a leading influence on the nature of our relations with the Powers on whom they were made.

“ Of the claims upon England it is unnecessary to speak, further than to say, that the state of things to which their prosecution and denial gave rise has been succeeded by arrangements productive of mutual good feeling and amicable relations between the two countries, which it is hoped will not be interrupted. One of these arrangements is that relating to the colonial trade, which was communicated to Congress at the last Session ; and although the short period during which it has been in force will not enable me to form an accurate judgment of its operation, there is every reason to believe that it will prove highly beneficial. The trade thereby authorized has employed to the 30th of September last, upwards of 30,000 tons of American, and 15,000 tons of foreign shipping in the outward voyages ; and, in the inward, nearly an equal amount of American, and 20,000 only of foreign tonnage. Advantages, too, have resulted to our agricultural interest from the state of the trade between Canada and our territories and states bordering on the St. Lawrence and the Lakes, which may prove more than equivalent to the loss sustained by the discrimination made to favour the trade of the northern colonies with the West Indies.

“ After our transition from the state of colonies to that of an in-



dependent nation, many points were found necessary to be settled between us and Great Britain. Among them was the demarcation of boundaries not described with sufficient precision in the treaty of peace. Some of the lines that divide the states and territories of the United States from the British provinces have been definitely fixed. That, however, which separates us from the provinces of Canada and New Brunswick to the north and the east, was still in dispute when I came into office. But I found arrangements made for its settlement, over which I had no control. The commissioners who had been appointed under the provisions of the treaty of Ghent having been unable to agree, a convention was made with Great Britain by my immediate predecessor in office, with the advice and consent of the Senate, by which it was agreed, 'that the points of difference which have arisen in the settlement of the boundary line between the American and British dominions, as described in the 5th article of the treaty of Ghent, shall be referred, as therein provided, to some friendly sovereign or state, who shall be invited to investigate and make a decision upon such points of difference.'

"And the king of the Netherlands having, by the late president and his Britannic Majesty, been designed as such friendly sovereign, it became my duty to carry with good faith the agreement so made into full effect. To this end I caused all the measures to be taken which were necessary to a full exposition of our case to the sovereign arbiter, and nominated as minister plenipotentiary to his court a distinguished citizen of the State most interested in the question,

and who had been one of the agents previously employed for settling the controversy. On the 10th day of January last, his majesty, the king of the Netherlands, delivered to the plenipotentiaries of the United States and of Great Britain his written opinion on the case referred to him. The papers in relation to the subject will be communicated by a special message to the proper branch of the government, with the perfect confidence that its wisdom will adopt such measures as will secure an amicable settlement of the controversy, without infringing any constitutional right of the State immediately interested.

"It affords me much satisfaction to inform you that suggestions, made by my direction, to the *Chargé d'Affaires* of his Britannic majesty, to this government, have had their desired effect in producing the release of certain American citizens, who were imprisoned for setting up the authority of the state of Maine, at a place in the disputed territory under the actual jurisdiction of his Britannic majesty. From this and the assurances I have received, of the desire of the local authorities to avoid any cause of collision, I have the best hopes that a good understanding will be kept up until it is confirmed by the final disposition of the subject.

"The amicable relations which now subsist between the United States and Great Britain, the increasing intercourse between their citizens, and the rapid obliteration of unfriendly prejudices to which former events naturally gave rise, concurred to present this as a fit period for renewing our endeavours to provide against the recurrence of causes of irritation, which, in



the event of war between Great Britain and any other power, would inevitably endanger our peace. Animated by the sincerest desire to avoid such a state of things, and peacefully to secure under all possible circumstances, the rights and honour of the country, I have given such instructions to the minister lately sent to the court of London, as will evince that desire; and if met by a correspondent disposition, which we cannot doubt, will put an end to causes of collision, which without advantage to either, tend to estrange from each other, two nations who have every motive to preserve, not only peace, but an intercourse of the most amicable nature.

“In my message at the opening of the last session of Congress, I expressed a confident hope, that the justice of our claims upon France, urged as they were with perseverance and signal ability by our minister there, would finally be acknowledged. This hope has been realized. A treaty has been signed which will immediately be laid before the senate for its approbation; and which, containing stipulations that require legislative acts, must have the concurrence of both houses before it can go into effect. By it the French government engage to pay a sum which, if not quite equal to that which may be found due to our citizens, will yet, it is believed, under all circumstances, be deemed satisfactory to those interested.

“The offer of a gross sum, instead of the satisfaction of each individual claim, was accepted, because the only alternatives were a rigorous exaction of the whole amount stated to be due on each claim, which might in some in-

stances be exaggerated by design in others overrated through error, and which therefore it would have been both ungracious and unjust to have insisted on, or a settlement by a mixed commission, to which the French negotiators were very averse, and which experience in other cases had shown to be dilatory, and often wholly inadequate to the end. A comparatively small sum is stipulated on our part to go to the extinction of all claims by French citizens on our government, and a reduction of duties on our cotton and their wines has been agreed on, as a consideration for the renunciation of an important claim for commercial privileges, under the construction they gave to the treaty for the cession of Louisiana.

“Should this treaty receive the proper sanction, a source of irritation will be stopped, that has for so many years in some degree alienated from each other two nations, who from interest, as well as the remembrance of early associations ought to cherish the most friendly relations; an encouragement will be given for perseverance in the demands of justice, by this new proof, that, if steadily pursued they will be listened to; and admonition will be afforded to those powers, if any, which may be inclined to evade them, that they will never be abandoned. Above all, a just confidence will be inspired in our fellow-citizens, that their government will exert all the powers with which they have invested it, in support of their just claims upon foreign nations: at the same time that the frank acknowledgement and provision for the payment of those which were addressed to our equity, although unsupported by legal proof, affords



a practical illustration of our submission to the divine rule of doing to others what we desire they should do unto us.

“Sweden and Denmark having made compensation for the irregularities committed by their vessels, or in their ports, to the perfect satisfaction of the parties concerned: and having renewed the treaties of commerce entered into with them, our political and commercial relations with those powers continue to be on the most friendly footing.

“With Spain, our differences up to the 22nd of February, 1819, were settled by the treaty of Washington of that date; but at a subsequent period, our commerce with the states, formerly colonies of Spain, on the continent of America, was annoyed and frequently interrupted by her public and private armed ships. They captured many of our vessels prosecuting a lawful commerce, and sold them and their cargoes; and at one time, to our demands for restoration and indemnity, opposed the allegation that they were taken in the violation of a blockade of all the ports of those states.

“This blockade was declaratory only, and the inadequacy of the force to maintain it was so manifest, that this allegation was varied to a charge of trade in contraband of war. This, in its turn, was also found untenable; and the minister whom I sent with instructions to press for the reparation that was due to our injured fellow citizens, has transmitted an answer to his demand, by which the captures are declared to have been legal, and are justified, because the independence of the states of America, never having been acknowledged by Spain, she had a

right to prohibit trade with them under her old colonial laws. This ground of defence was contradictory, not only to those which had been formerly alleged, but to the uniform practice and established laws of nations, and had been abandoned by Spain herself in the convention which granted indemnity to British subjects for captures, made at the same time, under the same circumstances, and for the same allegations with those of which we complain.

“I, however, indulge the hope that further reflection will lead to other views, and feel confident that when his Catholic majesty shall be convinced of the justice of the claims, his desire to preserve friendly relations between the two countries, which it is my earnest endeavour to maintain, will induce him to accede to our demand. I have therefore despatched a special messenger with instructions to our minister to bring the case once more to his consideration; to the end that if, which I cannot bring myself to believe, the same decision, that cannot but be deemed an unfriendly denial of justice, should be persisted in, the matter may, before your adjournment, be laid before you, the constitutional judges of what is proper to be done when negotiation for redress of injury fails.

“The conclusion of a treaty for indemnity with France seemed to present a favourable opportunity to renew our claims of a similar character on other powers; and particularly in the case of those upon Naples, more especially as in the course of former negotiations with that power, our failure to induce France to render us justice was used as an argument against us. The desires of the merchants



who were the principal sufferers have, therefore, been acceded to, and a mission has been instituted for the special purpose of obtaining for them a reparation already too long delayed. This measure having been resolved on, it was put in execution without waiting for the meeting of Congress, because the state of Europe created an apprehension of events that might have rendered our application ineffectual.

“Our demands upon the government of the Two Sicilies are of a peculiar nature. The injuries on which they are founded are not denied, nor are the atrocity and perfidy under which those injuries were perpetrated attempted to be extenuated. The sole ground on which indemnity has been refused is the alleged illegality of the tenure by which the monarch who made the seizures held his crown. This defence,—always unfounded in any principle of the law of nations—now universally abandoned, even by those Powers upon whom the responsibility for acts of past rulers bore the most heavily,—will unquestionably be given up by his Sicilian majesty, whose councils will receive an impulse from that high sense of honour and regard to justice which are said to characterize him; and I feel the fullest confidence that the talents of the citizen commissioned for that purpose will place before him the just claims of our injured citizens in such a light as will enable me, before your adjournment, to announce that they have been adjusted and secured. Precise instructions, to the effect of bringing the negotiation to a speedy issue, have been given and will be obeyed.

“In the blockade of Terceira, some of the Portuguese fleet cap-

tured several of our vessels, and committed other excesses for which reparation was demanded; and I was on the point of despatching an armed force, to prevent any recurrence of a similar violence and protect our citizens in the prosecution of their lawful commerce, when official assurances, on which I relied, made the sailing of the ships unnecessary. Since that period frequent promises have been made that full indemnity shall be given for the injuries inflicted and the losses sustained. In the performance there has been some, perhaps unavoidable, delay; but I have the fullest confidence that the earnest desire that this business may at once be closed, which our minister has been instructed strongly to express, will very soon be gratified. I have the better ground for this hope from the evidence of a friendly disposition which that government has shown by an actual reduction in the duty on rice, the produce of our Southern States, authorizing the anticipation that this important article of our export will soon be admitted on the same footing with that produced by the most favoured nation.

“With the other Powers of Europe, we have fortunately had no cause of discussion for the redress of injuries. With the empire of the Russians our political connexion is of the most liberal kind. We enjoy the advantages of navigation and trade given to the most favoured nation; but it has not yet suited their policy, or perhaps has not been found convenient from other considerations, to give stability and reciprocity to those privileges by a commercial treaty. The ill-health of the minister last year charged with mak-



ing a proposition for that arrangement, did not permit him to remain at St. Petersburg; and the attention of that government, during the whole of the period since his departure having been occupied by the war in which it was engaged, we have been assured that nothing could have been effected by his presence. A minister will soon be nominated, as well to effect this important object, as to keep up the relations of amity and good understanding, of which we have received so many assurances and proofs from his imperial majesty and the emperor his predecessor.

“The treaty with Austria opens to us an important trade with the hereditary dominions of the emperor, the value of which has been hitherto little known, and of course not sufficiently appreciated. While our commerce finds an entrance into the south of Germany by means of this treaty, those we have formed with the Hanseatic towns and Prussia, and others now in negotiation, will open that vast country to the enterprising spirit of our merchants, on the north: a country abounding in all the materials of a mutually beneficial commerce, filled with enlightened and industrious inhabitants, holding an important place in the politics of Europe, and to which we owe so many valuable citizens. The ratification of the treaty with the Porte was sent to be exchanged by the gentleman appointed our *Chargé d’ Affaires* to that court. Some difficulties had occurred on his arrival; but at the date of his last official despatch, he supposed they had been obviated, and that there was every prospect of the exchange being speedily effected.

“This finishes the connected

view I have thought it proper to give of our political and commercial relations in Europe. Every effort in my power will be continued to strengthen and extend them by treaties founded on principles of the most perfect reciprocity of interest, neither asking nor conceding any exclusive advantage, but liberating as far as it lies in my power, the activity and industry of our fellow-citizens from the shackles which foreign restrictions may impose.

“To China and the East Indies, our commerce continues in its usual extent and with increased facilities which the credit and capital of our merchants affords, by substituting bills for payments in specie. A daring outrage having been committed in those seas by the plunder of one of our merchantmen engaged in the pepper trade at a port in Sumatra, and the piratical perpetrators belonging to tribes in such a state of society, that the usual course of proceeding between civilized nations could not be pursued, I forthwith despatched a frigate with orders to require immediate satisfaction for the injury, and indemnity to the sufferers.

“Few changes have taken place in our connexions with the independent States of America since my last communication to Congress. The ratification of a commercial treaty with the united republics of Mexico has been for some time under deliberation in their Congress, but was still undecided at the date of our last despatches. The unhappy civil commotions that have prevailed there, were undoubtedly the cause of the delay; but as the government is now said to be tranquillized, we may hope soon to receive the ratification of the treaty, and an ar-



range for the demarcation of the boundaries between us. In the mean time an important trade has been opened with mutual benefit, from St. Louis, in the state of Missouri, by caravans to the interior provinces of Mexico. This commerce is protected in its progress through the Indian countries by the troops of the United States, which have been permitted to escort the caravans beyond our boundaries to the settled part of the Mexican territory.

“From central America I have received assurances of the most friendly kind, and gratifying application for our good offices to remove a supposed indisposition towards that government in a neighbouring state; this application was immediately and successfully complied with. They gave us also the pleasing intelligence that differences which had prevailed in their internal affairs had been peaceably adjusted. Our treaty with this republic continues to be faithfully observed, and promises a great and beneficial commerce between the two countries; a commerce of the greatest importance, if the magnificent project of a ship canal through the dominions of that state, from the Atlantic to the Pacific Ocean, now in serious contemplation, shall be executed.

“I have great satisfaction in communicating the success which has attended the exertions of our minister in Colombia to procure a very considerable reduction in the duties on our flour in that republic. Indemnity also has been stipulated for injuries received by our merchants from illegal seizures; and renewed assurances are given that the treaty between the two countries shall be faithfully observed.

“Chili and Peru seem to be

still threatened with civil commotions; and until they shall be settled, disorders may naturally be apprehended, requiring the constant presence of a naval force in the Pacific Ocean, to protect our fisheries, and guard our commerce.

“The disturbances that took place in the empire of Brazil, previously to, and immediately consequent upon, the abdication of the late emperor, necessarily suspended any effectual application for the redress of some past injuries suffered by our citizens from that government, while they have been the cause of others, in which all foreigners seem to have participated. Instructions have been given to our minister there, to press for indemnity due for losses occasioned by these irregularities; and to take care that our fellow citizens shall enjoy all the privileges stipulated in their favour by the treaty lately made between the two powers: all which the good intelligence that prevails between our minister at Rio Janeiro and the regency gives us the best reason to expect.

“I should have placed Buenos Ayres in the list of South American powers in respect to which nothing of importance affecting us was to be communicated, but for occurrences which have lately taken place at the Falkland Islands, in which the name of that republic has been used to cover, with a show of authority, acts injurious to our commerce, and to the property and liberty of our fellow citizens. In the course of the present year, one of our vessels, engaged in the pursuit of a trade which we have always enjoyed without molestation, has been captured by a band acting, as they pretend, under the authority of



the government of Buenos Ayres. I have therefore given orders for the despatch of an armed vessel to join our squadron in those seas, and aid in affording all lawful protection to our trade which shall be necessary; and shall without delay send a minister to inquire into the nature of the circumstances, and also of the claim, if any, that is set up by that government to those islands. In the mean time I submit the case to the consideration of Congress, to the end that they may clothe the executive with such authority and means as they may deem necessary for providing a force adequate to the complete protection of our fellow-citizens fishing and trading to those seas.

“This rapid sketch of our foreign relations, it is hoped, fellow-citizens, may be of some use in so much of your legislation as may bear on that important subject; while it affords to the country at large a source of high gratification in the contemplation of our political and commercial connexion with the rest of the world. At peace with all—having subjects of future difference with few, and those susceptible of easy adjustment,—extending our commerce gradually on all sides, and on none by any but the most liberal and mutually beneficial means,—we may, by the blessing of Providence, hope for all national prosperity which can be derived from an intercourse with foreign nations, guided by those eternal principles of justice and reciprocal good will, which are binding as well upon states as the individuals of whom they are composed.

“I have great satisfaction in making this statement of our affairs, because the cause of our national policy enables me to do it without

any indiscreet exposure of what in other governments is usually concealed from the people. Having none but a straightforward open course to pursue—guided by a single principle that will bear the strongest light—we have happily no political combinations to form, no alliances to entangle us, no complicated interests to consult; and in subjecting all we have done to the consideration of our citizens and to the inspection of the world, we give no advantage to other nations, and lay ourselves open to no injury.

“It may not be improper to add that to preserve this state of things and give confidence to the world in the integrity of our designs, all our consular and diplomatic agents are strictly enjoined to examine well every cause of complaint preferred by our citizens; and, while they urge with proper earnestness those that are well founded, to countenance none that are unreasonable or unjust, and to enjoin on our merchants and navigators the strictest obedience to the laws of the countries to which they resort, and a course of conduct in their dealings that may support the character of our nation and render us respected abroad.

“Connected with this subject, I must recommend a revisal of our consular laws. Defects and omissions have been discovered in their operation that ought to be remedied and supplied. For your further information on this subject, I have directed a report to be made by the secretary of state, which I shall hereafter submit to your consideration.

“The internal peace and security of our confederated states is the next principal object of the general government. Time and



experience have proved that the abode of the native Indian within their limits is dangerous to their peace and injurious to himself. In accordance with my recommendation at a former session of Congress, an appropriation of 500,000 dollars was made to aid the voluntary removal of the various tribes beyond the limits of the States. At the last session, I had the happiness to announce that the Chickasaws and Choctaws had accepted the generous offers of the government, and agreed to remove beyond the Mississippi river, by which the whole of the state of Mississippi and the western part of Alabama will be freed from Indian occupancy, and opened to a civilized population. The treaties with these tribes are in a course of execution, and their removal, it is hoped, will be completed in the course of 1832.

“At the request of the authorities of Georgia, the registration of the Cherokee Indians for emigration has been resumed and it is confidently expected, that one half, if not two thirds of that tribe will follow the wise example of their more westerly brethren. Those who prefer remaining at their present homes will hereafter be governed by the laws of Georgia as all her citizens are, and cease to be the object of peculiar care on the part of the general government.

“During the present year the attention of the government has been particularly directed to those tribes in the powerful and growing state of Ohio, where considerable tracts of the finest lands were still occupied by the aboriginal proprietors. Treaties, either absolute or conditional, have been made, extinguishing the whole Indian title to the reservations of that state; and the time is not distant, it is

hoped when Ohio will be no longer embarrassed with the Indian population. The same measure will be extended to Indiana, as soon as there is reason to anticipate success.

“But the removal of the Indians beyond the limits and jurisdiction of the States does not place them beyond the reach of philanthropic aid and christian instruction. On the contrary, those whom philanthropy may induce to live among them in their new abode, will be more free in the exercise of their benevolent functions, than if they had remained within the limits of the States, embarrassed by their internal regulations. Now, subject to no control but the superintending agency of the general government, exercised with the sole view of preserving peace, they may proceed unmolested in the interesting experiment of gradually advancing a community of American Indians from barbarism to the habits and enjoyments of civilized life.

“It is confidently believed, that perseverance for a few years in the present policy of the government, will extinguish the Indian title to all lands lying within the States, composing our federal union, and remove beyond their limits every Indian who was not willing to submit to their laws. Thus will all conflicting claims to jurisdiction between the States and the Indian tribes be put to rest. It is pleasing to reflect that results so beneficial not only to the States immediately concerned, but to the harmony of the union, will have been accomplished by measures equally advantageous to the Indians. What the native savages become when surrounded by dense population, and by mixing with the whites, may be seen in the miserable rem-



nants of a few eastern tribes, deprived of political and civil rights, forbidden to make contracts and subjected to guardians, dragging out a wretched existence, without excitement, without hope, and almost without thought.

“Among the happiest effects of the improved relations of our republic has been an increase of trade, producing a corresponding increase of revenue, beyond the most sanguine anticipations of the Treasury Department.

“The state of the public finances will be fully shown by the secretary to the Treasury, in the report which he will presently lay before you. I will here, however, congratulate you upon their prosperous condition.

“The revenue received in the present year will not fall short of 27,700,000 dollars, and the expenditures for all objects other than the public debt, will not exceed 14,700,000 dollars. The payment on account of the principal and interest of the debt, during the year, will exceed 16,500,000 of dollars, a greater sum than has been applied to that object, out of the revenue, in any year since the enlargement of the sinking fund, except the two years following immediately thereafter. The amount which will have been applied to the public debt from the 4th of March, 1829, to the 1st of January next, which is less than three years since the administration has been placed in my hands, will exceed 40,000,000 of dollars.

“From the large importations of the present year, it may be safely estimated that the revenue which will be received into the Treasury from that source during the next year, with the aid of

that received from the public lands, will considerably exceed the amount of the receipts of the present year; and it is believed that, with the means which the government will have at its disposal, from various sources, which will be fully stated by the proper department, the whole of the public debt may be extinguished, either by redemption or purchase, within four years of my administration. We shall then exhibit the rare example of a great nation, abounding in all the means of happiness and security, altogether free from debt.

“The confidence with which the extinguishment of the public debt may be anticipated presents an opportunity for carrying into effect more fully the policy in relation to import duties, which has been recommended in my former messages. A modification of the tariff, which shall produce a reduction of our revenue to the wants of the government, and an adjustment of the duties on imports with a view to equal justice in relation to all our national interests and to the counteraction of foreign policy, so far as it may be injurious to those interests, is deemed to be one of the principal objects which demand the consideration of the present Congress.

“Justice to the interests of the merchant as well as the manufacturer, requires, that material reductions in the import duties be prospective; and unless the present Congress shall dispose of the subject, the proposed reductions cannot properly be made to take effect at the period when the necessity for the revenue arising from present rates shall cease. It is therefore desirable that arrangements be adopted at your present



session to relieve the people from unnecessary taxation after the extinguishment of the public debt. In the exercise of that spirit of concession and conciliation which has distinguished the friends of our union in all great emergencies, it is believed that this object may be effected without injury to any national interest.

“In my annual message of December, 1829, I had the honour to recommend the adoption of a more liberal policy than that which then prevailed towards unfortunate debtors to the government; and I deem it my duty again to invite your attention to this subject.

“Actuated by similar views, Congress at their last session passed an act for the relief of certain insolvent debtors of the United States; but the provisions of that law have not been deemed such as were adequate to that relief to this unfortunate class of our fellow citizens, which may be safely extended to them. The points in which the law appears to be defective will be particularly communicated by the secretary of the Treasury, and I take pleasure in recommending such an extension of its provisions as will unfetter the enterprise of a valuable portion of our citizens, and restore to them the means of usefulness to themselves and the community.

“While deliberating upon this subject, I would also recommend to your consideration the propriety of so modifying the laws for enforcing the payment of the debts due either to the public or to individuals suing in the courts of the United States, as to restrict the imprisonment of the person to cases of fraudulent concealment of property. The personal liberty of the citizen seems too sacred to be

held, as in many cases it now is, at the will of a creditor to whom he is willing to surrender all the means he has of discharging his debt.

“The reports from the Secretaries of the War and Navy departments, and from the Postmaster-general, which accompany this message, present satisfactory views of the operations of the departments respectively under their charge, and suggest improvements which are worthy of, and to which I invite the serious attention of Congress. Certain defects and omissions having been discovered in the operation of the laws respecting parliaments they are pointed out in the accompanying report from the secretary of state.

“I have heretofore recommended amendments of the Federal Constitution giving the election of president and vice-president to the people, and limiting the service of the former to a single term. So important do I consider these changes in our fundamental law, that, I cannot, in accordance with my sense of duty, omit to press them upon the consideration of a new Congress. For my views more at large, as well in relation to these points, as to the disqualification of members of Congress to receive an office from a president in whose election they had an official agency, which I proposed as a substitute, I refer you to my former message.

“Our system of public accounts is extremely complicated, and, it is believed, may be much improved. Much of the present machinery, and a considerable portion of the expenditure of the public money may be dispensed with, while greater facilities can be afforded to the liquidation of claims upon the



government, and an examination into their justice and legality, quite as efficient as the present, secured. With a view to a general reform in the system, I recommend the subject to the attention of Congress.

“I deem it my duty again to call your attention to the condition of the district of Columbia. It was doubtless wise in the framers of our constitution, to place the people of this district under the jurisdiction of the general government; but, to accomplish the objects they had in view, it is not necessary that this people should be deprived of all the privileges of self-government. Independently of the difficulty of inducing the representatives of distant states to turn their attention to projects of laws which are not of the highest interest to their constituents, they are not individually, nor in Congress collectively, well qualified to legislate over the local concerns of this district.

“Consequently its interests are much neglected, and the people are almost afraid to present their grievances, lest a body in which they are not represented, and which feels little sympathy in their local relations, should, in its attempt to make laws for them, do more harm than good. Governed by the laws of the states whence they were severed, the two shores of the Potomac within the ten miles square have different penal codes; not the present codes of Virginia and Maryland, but such as existed in those states at the time of the cession to the United States.

“As Congress will not form a new code, and as the people of the district cannot make one for themselves, they are virtually under two governments. Is it not just

to allow them at least a delegate in Congress, if not a local legislature, to make laws for the district, subject to the approval or rejection of Congress. I earnestly recommend the extension to them of every political right which their interests require, and which may be compatible with the constitution.

“The extension of the judiciary system of the United States is deemed to be one of the duties of government. One fourth of the States in the union do not participate in the benefits of a circuit court. To the states of Indiana, Illinois, Missouri, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana, admitted into the union since the present judicial system was organized, only a district has been allowed.

“If this be sufficient, then the circuit courts already existing in 18 states ought to be abolished; if it be not sufficient, the defect ought to be abolished, and these states placed on the same footing with the other members of the union: it was on this condition, and on this footing that they entered the union; and they may demand circuit courts as a matter, not of concession, but of right. I trust that Congress will not adjourn, leaving the anomaly in our system.

“Entertaining the opinions heretofore expressed in relation to the Bank of the United States, as at present organized, I felt it my duty in my former messages frankly to disclose them, in order that the attention of the legislature and the people should be seasonably directed to that important subject, and that it might be considered and finally disposed of in a manner best calculated to promote the ends of the constitution, and subserve the public interest.

“Having thus conscientiously



discharged a constitutional duty, I deem it proper, on this occasion, without a more particular reference to the views of the subject then expressed, to leave it for the present to the investigation of an enlightened people and their representatives.

“In conclusion, permit me to invoke that Power which super-

intends all governments, to infuse into your deliberations, at this important crisis of our history, a spirit of mutual forbearance and conciliation. In that spirit was our union formed, and in that spirit must it be preserved.

“ANDREW JACKSON.

*Washington, Dec. 6, 1831.”*



# MANNERS, CUSTOMS, &c.

---

## PRESENT STATE OF THE PEASANTRY OF LIVONIA.

**T**HE position of the Livonian peasants has undergone some important changes within a few years: their masters have declared them *free men*. In the month of May, 1818, their enfranchisement was resolved upon in a Congress of proprietors, after which a commission, appointed by the emperor Alexander, undertook to fix the basis of this new liberty. Their labours, completed in a few months, were approved by the nobility, and soon after passed into a law. But a general irritation displayed itself among the serfs. In many cantons they assembled in arms and presented the strange spectacle of a population rising to maintain their slavery. Some elders, judges, and priests were deputed to them; these they insulted. Force was employed; they endeavoured to resist it. We reject, they said, this liberty which you establish against our wish; we do not wish to be detached from the soil which nourished our fathers. Let a property in that be granted to us, if it be pretended to set us free! If not, let us be left in our ancient slavery. The force which was displayed silenced these complaints. To understand them, it must be known, that in Livonia, as well as in Russia, certain principles of order and of justice had gained

access into the very bosom of slavery. The serfs transmitted regularly to their eldest sons the lands which had been entrusted to them, and it was almost unheard of that one should be deprived of his inheritance, except in consequence of some crime or serious offence. This species of infeudation, in virtue of which the possession of the same fields was retained in the same family, passed in the eyes of the serfs for a real right of property. Enfranchisement having raised, or in their opinion reduced, them to the condition of farmers, it was necessary to grant to their lords the right of dismissing them if they chose, at the expiration of their leases, and to replace them by other tenants. On this account the peasants thought themselves deprived of their ancient privileges, and made such energetic protestations.

With time the greater number have finished by perceiving the advantages of their new position, and less baseness and servility is already remarked in their intercourse with their lords. They have obtained the right of acquiring every species of real property except the lands of the nobility. After 1832 they may establish themselves indiscriminately in any part of Livonia, and from this



period also they may settle themselves in towns and purchase the rights of burgesses. Being detached from the glebe, they have seen permanent and uniform institutions take the place among them of an arbitrary regime. Public assemblies (communes) have been organized throughout the country,

and every peasant, who is of age, has been invested with the right of taking part in the debates of the general meeting, which, in each division, regulates the imposition of taxes, votes the expenses of the district, and elects the officers and judges.

### RUSSIAN MILITARY COLONIES.

[*From No. XVIII. of the Foreign Quarterly Review.*]

The colonization of a regiment consists in placing it in perpetual cantonments, in a territory which it never quits except for a campaign; and the other inhabitants are attached to the land of the colony, with an obligation to lodge and feed the soldiers, and successively furnish the recruits. Every thing in the colony receives a military stamp. The farmers or tenants are obliged to wear the uniform, are placed under the orders of old officers, and form what is called *the colonized battalion*. During their whole lives they remain subject to a severe discipline, which extends even to the direction of their agricultural labours. Their children are born soldiers; from the age of twelve years they receive the musket and cartouch box. Afterwards they enter into the reserve, and are subsequently placed in the active battalions. After fifteen years' service they return for five years into the reserve, and at last terminate their days as invalids of the colony, unless the inheritance of their fathers, or some new distribution of the land, should cause them to become cultivators or farmers. The male population

of a colony is therefore composed of the following elements.

1. *The farmers or cultivators properly so called.*

2. *The cantonists.* The male children of a military colony are thus called. They receive gratuitous instruction in the schools established by the government; at the same time they are taught one or more trades, and are exercised in the use of arms. At the age of eighteen, the strongest are placed in the reserve, after having undergone an examination.

3. *The soldiers of the reserve.* Each colonised regiment has a *battalion* of reserve, one half of which, in the event of war, is united with the active battalions, to enter upon service along with them. The cantonists terminate their military education in the reserve. They remain there for two years, and when at the age of twenty they enter the active battalions, they are fitted to be led at once to the field of battle.

4. *The soldiers of the active battalions.* These are ready to march at the first signal. Their long term of service, and still more the education they have received



as cantonists, make them from habit excellent soldiers. Their pay does not exceed eleven roubles a year; but they are clothed by the state, and the cultivators feed and lodge them. If they are themselves the eldest sons of farmers, and their father dies, or if in any other regular way they are called to the succession of a tenant, they are entitled to their discharge, and enter immediately into possession of their farm. As long as they remain under their colours, and no war or extraordinary service keeps them out of the territory of the colony, they serve as farm-servants to the tenants, and their labour repays these last for the expense of their maintenance.

5. *The invalids.* This denomination is bestowed on the old soldiers, who have completed their twenty years service. They enjoy, to the exclusion of the other individuals of the colony, the privilege of *allowing their beards to grow*. Being lodged among their relations or the other farmers, they share their labours, and when age or infirmities have weakened their strength, the government provides for their maintenance.

Finally, 6. A last class, without any particular denomination, comprises the old cantonists, who have performed no military service, on account of the weakness of their constitution, or a superabundance of recruits. These people, thrown upon their own resources, work as farm-servants, or gain their livelihood by the trades which the government has taught them. The lot of the colonised troops appears to me far preferable to that of the other Russian soldiers. These last, from the time they are enrolled, are in some sort dead to their family; all their former relations

are destroyed. The soldiers of the colonies, on the other hand, are not torn from their domestic ties; they remain children, fathers of families, even citizens to a certain degree.

As to the ancient serfs of the crown, who have been transformed into farmers or military cultivators, they have not been able as yet to accommodate themselves to their new position. With their affections crushed, these poor creatures grieve in silence. Ignorant simplicity made them value their former existence, and the recollection of this relative happiness, which was founded upon habit, never leaves them. Besides, they were subjected to the most severe labours during the first years; they cleared the ungrateful soil which was assigned to them, built villages, constructed bridges, roads, and canals. But these motives for regret and suffering will not exist for a second generation, whose lot, I think, will be less hard than that of the serfs of the crown. The farmers receive the title of *free men*, and this denomination, if it be ill suited to cultivators bowed down by military despotism, proves at least on the part of the government an intention rather to raise than to depress this class. The state supplies the farmers with a furnished habitation, six or eight hectares (from fifteen to twenty English acres) of land, cattle, and agricultural implements; and they pay neither property-tax, nor capitation, nor rent. All that they acquire becomes, at their death, the property of their natural heirs; the farm which is intrusted to them may in some degree be considered as their patrimony. When age no longer allows them to superintend its labours, or when they feel their



end approaching, they themselves nominate their successor. In this manner the possession of a farm may be perpetuated in the same family as a genuine property, and it is only in extreme cases, in consequence of a judicial sentence, that a tenant can be expelled from it.

In general, the power to which the cultivators are subjected is not arbitrary, as in the other villages of Russia. Thus, for example, none of them can be subjected to corporal punishment, without legal forms being gone through, and in each locality the primary jurisdiction is intrusted to an elective magistracy, which exercises at the same time certain functions of police as well as of administration.

Philanthropic precautions are taken to prevent indigence and misfortune. A magazine of wheat, maintained by the inhabitants at large, removes all danger of famine. The sick are taken care of gratuitously in a central hospital; orphans become the adoptive children of the colony, and the maintenance of the widows and the aged is provided for. A savings' and trading bank insures for the farmers the preservation of their gains, and in times of distress even advances

money to them without interest, to the extent of five hundred rubles.

The gratuitous instruction given to the children deserves the highest praise. Nothing is neglected to make them at once good agriculturists, well instructed soldiers, and skilful artisans. In the schools, which are organised according to the methods of Lancaster and Pestalozzi, they are taught to read and write; they are exercised in music and singing, are taught the elements of arithmetic, painting, and geometry; and the precepts of religion are explained to them.

Those who display most zeal and aptitude are placed in a school of sub-officers, and these children of moujiks (peasants) have before them a prospect of rising to the rank of officers, which they are entitled to after twelve years of irreproachable service. To sum up all, the internal management of the colonies procures for their inhabitants certain privileges and even positive rights. Liberty would there be sought for in vain; but, at least, order, justice, and the regular action of a paternal authority are seen in the model of slavery.

---

#### THE DAY OF A PHILADELPHIAN LADY.

[From Mrs. Trollope's "*Domestic Manners of the Americans.*"]

The wife of a senator and lawyer of repute in Philadelphia, has a very handsome house, with white marble steps and door-posts, and a delicate silver knocker and door-handle; she has very handsome drawing-rooms, very handsomely furnished, (there is a side-board in one of them, but it is very handsome, and has very handsome de-

canters and cut-glass water-jugs upon it): she has a very handsome carriage, and a very handsome free black coachman; she is always very handsomely dressed; and, moreover, she is very handsome herself. She rises, and her first hour is spent in the scrupulously nice arrangement of her dress; she descends to her parlour neat, stiff,



and silent; her breakfast is brought in by her free black footman; she eats her fried ham and her salt fish, and drinks her coffee in silence, while her husband reads one newspaper, and puts another under his elbow; and then, perhaps, she washes the cups and saucers. Her carriage is ordered at eleven; till that hour she is employed in the pastry-room, her snow-white apron protecting her mouse-coloured silk. Twenty minutes before her carriage should appear, she retires to her chamber, as she calls it, shakes, and folds up her still snow-white apron, smooths her rich dress, and with nice care, sets on her elegant bonnet, and all the handsome *et cætera*; then walks down stairs, just at the moment that her free black coachman announces to her free black footman that the carriage waits. She steps into it, and gives the word, "Drive to the Dorcas society." Her footman stays at home to clean the knives, but her coachman can trust his horses while he opens the carriage door, and his lady not being accustomed to a hand or an arm, gets out very safely without, though one of her own is occupied by a work-basket, and the other by a large roll of all those indescribable matters which ladies take as offerings to Dorcas societies. She enters the parlour appropriated for the meeting, and finds seven other ladies, very like herself, and takes her place among them; she presents her contribution, which is accepted with a gentle circular smile, and her parings of broad cloth, her ends of ribbon, her gilt paper, and her minikin pins, are added to the parings of broad cloth, the ends of ribbon, the gilt paper, and the minikin pins, with which the table is already covered;

she also produces from her basket three ready made pincushions, five ink-wipers, seven paper-matches, and a pasteboard watch-case; these are welcomed with acclamations, and the youngest lady present deposits them carefully on the shelves, amid a prodigious quantity of similar articles. She then produces her thimble, and asks for work; it is presented to her, and the eight ladies all stitch together for some hours. Their talk is of priests and of missions; of the profits of their last sale, of their hopes from the next; of the doubt whether young Mr. This, or young Mr. That should receive the fruits of it to fit him out for Liberia: of the very ugly bonnet seen at church on sabbath morning, of the very handsome preacher who performed on Sabbath afternoon, and of the very large collection made on Sabbath evening. This lasts till three, when the carriage again appears, and the lady and her basket return home; she mounts to her chamber, carefully sets aside her bonnet and its appurtenances, puts on her scoloped black silk apron, walks into the kitchen to see that all is right, then into the parlour, where, having cast a careful glance over the table prepared for dinner, she sits down, work in hand, to await her spouse. He comes, shakes hands with her, spits, and dines. The conversation is not much, and ten minutes suffices for the dinner; fruit and toddy, the newspaper and the work-bag succeed. In the evening the gentleman, being a savant, goes to the Wister society, and afterwards plays a snug rubber at a neighbour's. The lady receives at tea a young missionary and three members of the Dorcas society—And so ends her day.



## AMERICAN SOCIETY.

[From the Same.]

Whatever may be the talents of the persons who meet together in society, the very shape, form, and arrangement of the meeting is sufficient to paralyse conversation. The women invariably herd together at one part of the room, and the men at the other; but, in justice to Cincinnati, I must acknowledge that this arrangement is by no means peculiar to that city, or to the western side of the Alleghanies. Sometimes a small attempt at music produces a partial reunion; a few of the most daring youths, animated by the consciousness of curled hair and smart waistcoats, approach the piano-forte, and begin to mutter a little to the half-grown pretty things, who are comparing with one another "how many quarters' music they have had." Where the mansion is of sufficient dignity to have two drawing-rooms, the piano, the little ladies, and the slender gentlemen are left to themselves; and on such occasions the sound of laughter is often heard to issue from among them. But the fate of the more dignified personages, who are left in the other room, is extremely dismal. The gentlemen, spit, talk of elections and the price of produce, and spit again. The ladies look at each other's dresses till they know every pin by heart; talk of Parson Somebody's last sermon on the day of judgment, or Dr. Totherbody's new pills for dyspepsia, till the "tea" is announced, when they all console themselves together for whatever they may have suffer-

ed in keeping awake, by taking more tea, coffee, hot cake and custard, hoe cake, johnny cake, waffle cake, and dodger cake, pickled peaches, and preserved cucumbers, ham, turkey, hung beef, apple sauce, and pickled oysters, than ever were prepared in any other country of the known world. After this massive meal is over, they return to the drawing-room, and it always appeared to me that they remained together as long as they could bear it, and then they rise *en masse*—cloak, bonnet, shawl, and exit.

In America, with the exception of dancing, which is almost wholly confined to the unmarried of both sexes, all the enjoyments of the men are found in the absence of the women. They dine, they play cards, they have musical meetings, they have suppers, all in large parties, but all without women. Were it not that such is the custom, it is impossible but that they would have ingenuity enough to find some expedient for sparing the wives and daughters of the opulent the sordid offices of household drudgery which they almost all perform in their families. Even in the slave states, though they may not clearstarch and iron, mix puddings and cakes one half of the day, and watch them baking the other half, still the very highest occupy themselves in their household concerns, in a manner that precludes the possibility of their becoming elegant and enlightened companions.



Mrs. Trollope gives the following description of a ball and supper, at which she was present.

The arrangements for the supper were very singular, but eminently characteristic of the country. The gentlemen had a splendid entertainment spread for them in another large room of the hotel, while the poor ladies had each a plate put into their hands, as they pensively promenaded the ball-room during their absence; and shortly afterwards servants appeared, bearing trays of sweetmeats, cakes, and creams. The fair creatures then sat down on a row of chairs placed round the walls, and each making a table of her knees, began

eating her sweet, but sad and sulky repast. The effect was extremely comic; their gala dresses and the decorated room forming a contrast the most unaccountable with their uncomfortable and forlorn condition.

This arrangement was owing neither to economy nor want of a room large enough to accommodate the whole party, but purely because the gentlemen liked it better. This was the answer given me, when my curiosity tempted me to ask why the ladies and gentlemen did not sup together; and this was the answer repeated to me afterwards by a variety of people to whom I put the same question.

---

#### AMERICAN SERVANTS.

[*From the Same.*]

The greatest difficulty in organising a family establishment in Ohio is getting servants, or, as it is there called, "getting help," for it is more than petty treason to the republic to call a free citizen a *servant*. The whole class of young women, whose bread depends upon their labour, are taught to believe that the most abject poverty is preferable to domestic service. Hundreds of half-naked girls work in the paper-mills, or in any other manufactory, for less than half the wages they would receive in service; but they think their equality is compromised by the latter, and nothing but the wish to obtain some particular article of finery will ever induce them to submit to it. A kind friend, however, exerted herself so effectually for me, that a tall stately lass soon presented herself, saying, "I be come to help you." The intelligence was

very agreeable, and I welcomed her in the most gracious manner possible, and asked what I should give her by the year. "Oh Gimini!" exclaimed the damsel, with a loud laugh, "you be a downright Englisher, sure enough. I should like to see a young lady engaged by the year in America! I hope I shall get a husband before many months, or I expect I shall be an outright old maid, for I be most seventeen already; besides, mayhap I may want to go to school. You must just give me a dollar and a half a week; and mother's slave, Phillis, must come over once a week, I expect, from t'other side the water, to help me clean." I agreed to the bargain, of course, with all dutiful submission; and seeing she was preparing to set to work in a yellow dress parseme with red roses, I gently hinted, that I thought it was a pity to spoil so fine a gown,



and that she had better change it. "Tis just my best and worst," she answered, "for I have got no other." And in truth I found that this young lady had left the paternal mansion with no more clothes of any kind than what she had on. I immediately gave her money to purchase what was necessary for cleanliness and decency, and set to work with my daughters to make her a gown. She grinned applause when our labour was completed, but never uttered the slightest expression of gratitude for that or for anything else we could do for her. She was constantly asking us to lend her different articles of dress, and when we declined it, she said, "Well, I never seed such grumpy folks as you be; there is several young ladies of my acquaintance what goes to live out now and then with the old women about the town, and they and their gurls always lends them what they asks for; I guess, you English thinks we should poison your things, just as bad as if we was negurs." And here I beg to assure the reader, that whenever I give conversations, they were not made *à loisir*, but were written down immediately after they occurred, with all the verbal fidelity my memory permitted.

This young lady left me at the end of two months, because I refused to lend her money enough to buy a silk dress to go to a ball, saying, "Then it is not worth my while to stay any longer." I cannot imagine it possible that such a state of things can be desirable or beneficial to any of the parties

concerned. I might occupy a hundred pages on the subject, and yet fail to give an adequate idea of the sore, angry, ever-wakeful pride that seemed to torment these poor wretches. In many of them it was so excessive, that all feeling of displeasure, or even of ridicule, was lost in pity. One of these was a pretty girl, whose natural disposition must have been gentle and kind; but her good feelings were soured, and her gentleness turned into morbid sensitiveness, by having heard a thousand and a thousand times that she was as good as any other lady, that all men were equal, and women too, and that it was a sin and a shame for a free-born American to be treated like a servant. When she found she was to dine in the kitchen, she turned up her pretty lip, and said, "I guess that's 'cause you don't think I'm good enough to eat with you. You'll find that won't do here." I found afterwards that she rarely ate any dinner at all, and generally passed the time in tears. I did every thing in my power to conciliate and make her happy, but I am sure she hated me. I gave her very high wages, and she staid till she had obtained several expensive articles of dress, and then, *un beau matin*, she came to me full dressed, and said, "I must go."—"When shall you return, Charlotte?"—"I expect you will see no more of me." And so we parted. Her sister was also living with me, but her ward-robe was not yet completed, and she remained some weeks longer till it was.



## AMERICAN CAMP MEETING.

*[From the Same.]*

It was in the course of this summer that I found the opportunity I had long wished for, of attending a camp-meeting, and I gladly accepted the invitation of an English lady and gentleman to accompany them in their carriage to the spot where it is held; this was in a wild district on the confines of Indiana.

The prospect of passing a night in the back woods of Indiana was by no means agreeable, but I screwed my courage to the proper pitch, and set forth determined to see with my own eyes, and hear with my own ears, what a camp-meeting really was. I had heard it said, that being at a camp-meeting was like standing at the gate of heaven, and seeing it opening before you; I had heard it said, that being at a camp-meeting was like finding yourself within the gates of hell; in either case there must be something to gratify curiosity, and compensate for the fatigues of a long rumbling ride and a sleepless night.

We reached the ground about an hour before midnight, and the approach to it was highly picturesque. The spot chosen was the verge of an unbroken forest, where a space of about twenty acres appeared to have been partially cleared for the purpose. Tents of different sizes were pitched very near together in a circle round the cleared space; behind them were ranged an exterior circle of carriages of every description, and at the back of each were fastened the horses which had drawn them thither. Through this triple circle

of defence we distinguished numerous fires burning brightly within it: and still more numerous lights flickering from the trees that were left in the enclosure. The moon was in meridian splendour above our heads.

We left the carriage to the care of a servant, who was to prepare a bed in it for Mrs. B. and me, and entered the inner circle. The first glance reminded me of Vauxhall, from the effect of the lights among the trees, and the moving crowd below them; but the second showed a scene totally unlike any thing I had ever witnessed. Four high frames, constructed in the form of altars, were placed at the four corners of the enclosure; on these were supported layers of earth and sod, on which burned immense fires of blazing pine-wood. On one side a rude platform was erected to accommodate the preachers, fifteen of whom attended this meeting, and with very short intervals for necessary refreshment and private devotion, preached in rotation, day and night, from Tuesday to Saturday.

When we arrived, the preachers were silent; but we heard issuing from nearly every tent mingled sounds of praying, preaching, singing, and lamentation. The curtains in front of each tent were dropped, and the faint light that gleamed through the white drapery, backed as it was by the dark forest, had a beautiful and mysterious effect, that set the imagination at work; and had the sounds which vibrated around us been less discordant, harsh, and unnatural,



I should have enjoyed it ; but listening at the corner of a tent which poured forth more than its proportion of clamour, in a few moments chased every feeling derived from imagination, and furnished realities that could neither be mistaken nor forgotten.

Great numbers of persons were walking about the ground, who appeared like ourselves to be present only as spectators ; some of these very unceremoniously contrived to raise the drapery of this tent, at one corner, so as to afford us a perfect view of the interior.

The floor was covered with straw, which round the sides was heaped in masses, that might serve as seats, but which at that moment were used to support the heads and the arms of the close-packed circle of men and women who kneeled on the floor.

Out of about thirty persons thus placed, perhaps half a dozen were men. One of these, a handsome looking youth of eighteen or twenty, kneeled just below the opening through which I looked. His arm was encircling the neck of a young girl who knelt beside him with her hair hanging disshevelled upon her shoulders, and her features working with the most violent agitation ; soon after they both fell forward on the straw, as if unable to endure in any other attitude the burning eloquence of a tall grim figure in black, who, standing erect in the centre, was uttering with incredible vehemence an oration that seemed to hover between praying and preaching ; his arms hung stiff and immovable by his side, and he looked like an ill-constructed machine, set in action by a movement so violent, as to threaten its own destruction, so jerkingly, painfully, yet rapidly,

did his words tumble out ; the kneeling circle ceasing not to call in every variety of tone, on the name of Jesus ; accompanied with sobs, groans, and a sort of low howling inexpressibly painful to listen to. But my attention was speedily withdrawn from the preacher, and the circle round him, by a figure which knelt alone at some distance ; it was a living image of Scott's Macbriar, as young, as wild, and as terrible. His thin arms tossed above his head, had forced themselves so far out of the sleeves, that they were bare to the elbow ; his large eyes glared frightfully, and he continued to scream without an instant's intermission the word " Glory ! " with a violence that seemed to swell every vein to bursting. It was too dreadful to look upon long, and we turned away shuddering.

We made the circuit of the tents, pausing where attention was particularly excited by sounds more vehement than ordinary. We contrived to look into many ; all were strewn with straw, and the distorted figures that we saw kneeling, sitting, and lying amongst it, joined to the woeful and convulsive cries, gave to each the air of a cell in Bedlam. One tent was occupied exclusively by negroes. They were all full-dressed, and looked exactly as if they were performing a scene on a stage. One woman wore a dress of pink gauze trimmed with silver lace ; another was dressed in pale yellow silk ; one or two had splendid turbans ; and all wore a profusion of ornaments. The men were in snow white pantaloons, with gay-coloured linen jackets. One of these, a youth of coal-black comeliness, was preaching with the most violent gesticu-



lations, frequently springing high from the ground, and clapping his hands over his head. Could our missionary societies have heard the trash he uttered by way of an address to the Deity, they might perhaps have doubted whether his conversion had much enlightened his mind.

At midnight a horn sounded through the camp, which, we were told, was to call the people from private to public worship; and we presently saw them flocking from all sides to the front of the preachers' stand. Mrs. B. and I contrived to place ourselves with our backs supported against the lower part of this structure, and we were thus enabled to witness the scene which followed, without personal danger. There were about 2,000 persons assembled.

One of the preachers began in a low nasal tone, and, like all other Methodist preachers, assured us of the enormous depravity of man as he comes from the hands of his Maker, and of his perfect sanctification after he had wrestled sufficiently with the Lord to get hold of him, *et cætera*. The admiration of the crowd was evinced by almost constant cries of "Amen! Amen!" "Jesus! Jesus!" "Glory! Glory!" and the like. But this comparative tranquillity did not last long: the preacher told them that "this night was the time fixed upon for anxious sinners to wrestle with the Lord;" that he and his brethren "were at hand to help them," and that such as needed their help were to come forward into "the pen." The phrase forcibly recalled Milton's lines—

'Blind mouths! that scarce themselves  
know how to hold  
A sheep-hook, or have learned aught  
else the least

That to the faithful herdsman's art belongs!

—But when they list their lean and  
flashy songs,

Grate on their scannell pipes of wretched  
straw;—

The hungry sheep look up, and are  
not fed!

But swoln with wind, and the rank mist  
they draw,

Rot inwardly — and foul contagion  
spread."

"The pen" was the space immediately below the preachers' stand; we were therefore placed on the edge of it, and were enabled to see and hear all that took place in the very centre of this extraordinary exhibition.

The crowd fell back at the mention of the pen, and for some minutes there was a vacant space before us. The preachers came down from their stand and placed themselves in the midst of it, beginning to sing a hymn calling upon the penitents to come forth. As they sang they kept turning themselves round to every part of the crowd, and, by degrees, the voices of the whole multitude joined in chorus. This was the only moment at which I perceived any thing like the solemn and beautiful effect which I had heard ascribed to this woodland worship. It is certain that the combined voices of such a multitude, heard at dead of night, from the depths of their eternal forests, the many fair young faces turned upward, and looking paler and lovelier as they met the moonbeams, the dark figures of the officials in the middle of the circle, the lurid glare thrown by the altar-fires on the woods beyond, did altogether produce a fine and solemn effect, that I shall not easily forget; but ere I had well enjoyed it, the scene changed, and sublimity gave place to horror and disgust.



The exhortation nearly resembled that which I had heard at "the Revival," but the result was very different; for, instead of the few hysterical women who had distinguished themselves on that occasion, above a hundred persons, nearly all females, came forward, uttering howlings and groans, so terrible that I shall never cease to shudder when I recall them. They appeared to drag each other forward, and on the word being given, "let us pray," they all fell on their knees; but this posture was soon changed for others that permitted greater scope for the convulsive movements of their limbs; and they were soon all lying on the ground in an indescribable confusion of heads and legs. They threw about their limbs with such incessant and violent motion, that I was every instant expecting some serious accident to occur.

But how am I to describe the sounds that proceeded from this strange mass of human beings? I know no words which can convey an idea of it. Hysterical sobbings, convulsive groans, shrieks and screams the most appalling, burst forth on all sides. I felt sick with horror. As if their hoarse and overstrained voices failed to make noise enough, they soon began to clap their hands violently. The scene described by Dante was before me:—

"Quivi sospiri, pianti, ed alti guai  
Risonavan per l'aere ———  
———Orribili favelle  
Parole di dolore, accenti d'ira  
Voci alti e fioche, e suon di man con elle."

Many of these wretched creatures were beautiful young females. The preachers moved about among them, at once exciting and soothing their agonies. I heard the muttered "Sister! dear sister!"

I saw the insidious lips approach the cheeks of the unhappy girls; I heard the murmured confessions of the poor victims, and I watched their tormentors, breathing into their ears consolations that tinged the pale cheek with red. Had I been a man, I am sure I should have been guilty of some rash act of interference; nor do I believe that such a scene could have been acted in the presence of Englishmen without instant punishment being inflicted; not to mention the salutary discipline of the treadmill, which, beyond all question, would, in England, have been applied to check so turbulent and so vicious a scene.

After the first wild burst that followed their prostration, the moanings, in many instances, became loudly articulate; and I then experienced a strange vibration between tragic and comic feeling.

A very pretty girl, who was kneeling in the attitude of Canova's Magdalene immediately before us, amongst an immense quantity of jargon, broke out thus: "Woe! woe to the backsliders! hear it, hear it Jesus! when I was fifteen my mother died, and I backslided, oh Jesus, I backslided! take me home to my mother, Jesus! take me home to her, for I am weary! Oh John Mitchel! John Mitchel!" and after sobbing piteously behind her raised hands, she lifted her sweet face again, which was as pale as death, and said, "Shall I sit on the sunny bank of salvation with my mother, my own dear mother? oh Jesus, take me home, take me home!"

Who could refuse a tear to this earnest wish for death of one so lovely? But I saw her, ere I left the ground, with her hand fast locked, and her head supported by a man who



looked very much as Don Juan might, when sent back to earth as too bad for the regions below.

One woman near us continued to "call on the Lord," as it is termed, in the loudest possible tone, and without a moment's interval, for the two hours that we kept our dreadful station. She became frightfully hoarse, and her face so red as to make me expect she would burst a blood-vessel. Among the rest of her rant, she said "I will hold fast to Jesus, I never will let him go; if they take me to hell, I will still hold him fast, fast, fast!"

The stunning noise was sometimes varied by the preachers beginning to sing; but the convulsive movements of the poor maniacs only became more violent. At length the atrocious wickedness of this horrible scene increased to a degree of grossness, that drove us from our station; we returned to the carriage at about three o'clock in the morning, and passed the remainder of the night in listening to the ever increasing tumult at

the pen. To sleep was impossible. At day-break the horn again sounded, to send them to private devotion; and in about an hour afterwards I saw the whole camp as joyously and eagerly employed in preparing and devouring their most substantial breakfasts as if the night had been passed in dancing; and I marked many a fair but pale face, that I recognized as a demoniac of the night, simpering beside a swain, to whom she carefully administered hot coffee and eggs. The preaching saint and the howling sinner seemed alike to relish this mode of recruiting their strength.

After enjoying abundance of strong tea, which proved a delightful restorative after a night so strangely spent, I wandered alone into the forest, and I never remember to have found perfect quiet more delightful.

We soon after left the ground; but before our departure we learnt that a very *satisfactory* collection had been made by the preachers, for Bibles, Tracts, and *all other religious purposes*.



## THE ARTS.

---

### THE LIFE-BUOY NOW IN USE IN THE NAVY.

[From Capt. Hall's *Fragments of Voyages and Travels.*]

The life-buoy at present in use on board his majesty's ships, and, I suppose, in all Indiamen, as well as, I trust, in most merchant-ships, consists of two hollow copper vessels connected together, each about as large as an ordinary-sized pillow, and of buoyancy and capacity sufficient to support one man standing upon them. Should there be more than one person requiring support, they can lay hold of rope beackets fitted to the buoy, and so sustain themselves. Between the two copper vessels there stands up a hollow pole, or mast, into which is inserted, from below, an iron rod, whose lower extremity is loaded with lead, in such a manner, that when the buoy is let go, the iron rod slips down to a certain extent, lengthens the lever, and enables the lead at the end to act as ballast. By this means the mast is kept upright, and the buoy prevented from upsetting. The weight at the end of the rod is arranged so as to afford secure footing for two persons, should that number reach it; and there are also, as I said before, large rope beackets through which others can thrust their head and shoulders, till assistance is rendered.

On the top of the mast is fixed a port-fire, calculated to burn, I

think, twenty minutes, or half-an-hour; this is ignited most ingeniously by the same process which lets the buoy fall into the water. So that a man falling overboard at night, is directed to the buoy by the blaze on the top of its pole or mast, and the boat sent to rescue him also knows in what direction to pull. Even supposing, however, the man not to have gained the life-buoy, it is clear that, if above the surface at all, he must be somewhere in that neighbourhood; and if he shall have gone down, it is still some satisfaction, by recovering the buoy, to ascertain that the poor wretch is not left to perish by inches.

The method by which this excellent invention is attached to the ship, and dropped into the water in a single instant, is, perhaps, not the least ingenious part of the contrivance. The buoy is generally fixed amidships over the stern, where it is held securely in its place by being strung, or threaded, as it were, on two strong perpendicular iron rods fixed to the taff-rail, and inserted in holes piercing the frame-work of the buoy. The apparatus is kept in its place by what is called a slip-stopper, a sort of catch-bolt, which can be unlocked at pleasure, by



merely pulling a trigger. Upon withdrawing the stopper, the whole machine slips along the rods, and falls at once into the ship's wake. The trigger, which unlocks the slip-stopper, is furnished with a lanyard, passing through a hole in the stern, and having at its inner end a large knob, marked "Life-Buoy;" this alone is used in the daytime. Close at hand is another wooden knob, marked "Lock," fastened to the end of a line fixed to the trigger of a gun-lock, primed with powder; and so arranged, that when the line is pulled, the port-fire is instantly ignited, while, at the same moment, the life-buoy descends, and floats merrily away, blazing like a light-house. It would surely be an improvement

to have both these operations always performed simultaneously, that is, by one pull of the string. The port-fire would thus be lighted in every case of letting go the buoy; and I suspect the smoke in the daytime would often be as useful in guiding the boat, as the blaze always is at night. The gunner who has charge of the life-buoy lock, sees it freshly and carefully primed every evening at quarters, of which he makes a report to the captain. In the morning the priming is taken out, and the lock uncocked. During the night a man is always stationed at this part of the ship, and every half hour, when the bell strikes, he calls out "Life-buoy!" to show that he is awake and at his post.

## P A T E N T S.

D. PAPPS, Stanley End, in the parish of King Stanley, co. Gloucester, machine maker, for certain improvements in machinery for dressing or roughing woollen cloths.

W. Wood, Summer Hill, Northumberland, near Newcastle-upon-Tyne, for the application of a battering-ram to the purpose of working coal in mines.

M. E. A. PERTIUS, No. 56, Rue du Bac, Paris, spinster, for the fabrication or preparation of a coal fitted for refining and purifying sugar and other matters (communicated by a foreigner).

J. Ferrabee, Thrupp mill and foundry, in the parish of Stroud, co. Gloucester, engineer, for improvements in the machinery for preparing the pile or face of woollen or other cloths requiring such a process.

J. Blackwell and T. Alcock, both of Claines, co. Worcester, machine makers, and lace or bobbin-net manufacturers, for certain improvements in machines or machinery for making lace, commonly called bobbin-net.

S. Seaward, of the canal iron works,

in the parish of All Saints, Poplar, Middlesex, engineer, for an improvement or improvements in apparatus for economising steam and for other purposes, and the application thereof to the boilers of steam-engines employed on board packet-boats and other vessels.

W. Parker, Albany-street, Regent's Park, Middlesex, gent. for certain improvements in preparing animal charcoal.

J. and G. Rodgers, Sheffield, York, cutlers; and T. Fellows, jun. of New Cross, Deptford, Kent, gent. for an improved skate.

A. Smith, Princes-street, Leicester-square, in the parish of St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, Middlesex, engineer, for certain improvements in machinery for propelling boats and other vessels on water, and in the manner of constructing boats or vessels for carrying such machinery.

J. G. Ulrich, Nicholas-lane, London, chronometer maker, for certain improvements in chronometers.

C. M. Hannington, Nelson-square,



Surrey, gent. for an improved apparatus for impressing, stamping, or printing, for certain purposes.

L. Schwabe, Manchester, manufacturer, for certain processes and apparatus for preparing, beaming, printing, and weaving yarns of cotton, linen, silk, woollen, and other fibrous substances, so that any design, device, or figure, printed on such yarn, may be preserved when such yarn is woven into cloth or other fabric.

R. Winch, Gunpowder-alley, Shoe-lane, London, printers' joiner, for certain improvements in printing machines.

J. Bates, Bishopsgate-street-within, London, esq. for certain improvements in refining and clarifying sugar (communicated by a foreigner).

J. C. Schwieso, Regent-street, Middlesex, musical instrument maker, for certain improvements on piano-fortes and other stringed instruments.

W. Sumner, Hose, co. Leicester, lace maker, for certain improvements in machinery for making lace, commonly called bobbin-net.

G. G. Gardner, New York, but now residing at Threadneedle-street, London, gent. for an improved roving machine (communicated by a foreigner).

W. W. Richards, Birmingham, co. Warwick, gun maker, for certain improvements in the touch-holes and primers, suitable to percussion-guns, pistols, and all sorts of fire-arms fired upon that principle.

J. Gunby, George-street Sand Pitts, Birmingham, artist, for an improved method or methods of combining glass with metal, metals, or other substances, applicable to various useful and ornamental purposes.

C. Guillotte, Crispin-street, Spital-fields, Middlesex, machine-maker, for an improvement in the rack applicable to the battons of looms, or machinery for weaving plain or figured ribbons (partly communicated by a foreigner).

W. Morgan, York-terrace, Regent's Park, esq. for certain improvements in steam-engines.

J. Thomson, Spencer-street, Goswell-street-road, Middlesex, gent. for certain improvements in making or producing printing types.

T. Bailey, Leicester, co. Leicester, frame-smith, and C. Bailey, of the same place, frame-smith, for certain improvements in machinery for making lace, commonly called bobbin-net.

W. Payne, New Bond-street, in the parish of St. George, Hanover-square,

Middlesex, watch and clock maker, for an improved pedometer for the waistcoat pocket, upon a new and very simple construction.

J. Grime, the younger, Bury, Lancashire, copper-plate engraver, for a certain method of dissolving snow and ice on the trams or railways, in order that locomotive steam-engines and carriages, and other carriages, may pass over railroads without any obstruction or impediment from such snow or ice.

R. Burgess, Northwick, co. Chester, M. D. for a drink for the cure, prevention, or relief of gout, gravel, and other diseases, which may be also applied to other purposes.

S. Dunn, Southampton, engineer, for certain improvements in, or a method of, generating steam.

R. Trevithick, St. Aith, Cornwall, for an improved steam-engine.

R. Trevithick, St. Aith, Cornwall, for a method or apparatus for heating apartments.

W. Sneath, Ison Green, Nottinghamshire, lace-maker, for certain improvements in, or additions to, machinery for making, figuring, or ornamenting lace or net, and such other articles to which the said machinery may be applicable.

R. Abbey, Walthamstow, Essex, gent. for a new mode of preparing the leaf of a British plant, for the producing a healthy beverage by infusion.

W. Furnivals, Wharton, co. Chester, esq. for certain improvements in evaporating brine.

J. Phillips, Arnold, Nottinghamshire, servant-man, for certain improvements on bridles.

R. Williams, College-wharf, Belvidere-road, Lambeth, Surrey, engineer, for certain improvements in steam-engines.

D. Seldon, Liverpool, Lancashire, merchant, for a certain improvement or certain improvements in machinery used to give a degree of consistency to, and to wind on to, bobbins, barrels, or spools, rovings of cottons, and the like fibrous substances (communicated by a foreigner).

D. Napier, Warren-street, Fitzroy-square, engineer; and J. Napier and W. Napier, of Glasgow, engineers, for certain improvements in machinery for propelling locomotive carriages.

A. Pellatt, Falcon Glass Works, Holland-street, Blackfriars-bridge, Surrey, glass manufacturer, for an improved mode of forming glass vessels and utensils with ornamental figured patterns



impressed thereon (partly communicated by a foreigner).

R. Stephenson, Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Northumberland, engineer, for an improvement in the axles and parts which form the bearings at the centre of wheels for carriages, which are to travel upon edge-railways.

W. Peeke, Torquay, parish of Tormsham, Devonshire, shipwright, and T. Hammick, of the same place, shipsmith, for certain improvements in rudder-hangings and rudders for ships or vessels.

G. W. Turner, Bermondsey, Surrey, paper-maker, for certain improvements in machinery or apparatus for making paper.

P. Phillips, jun. Bristol, vinegar-maker, for certain improvements in manufacturing sulphuric acid, commonly called oil of vitriol.

John Potter and James Potter, Spiedly, near Manchester, spinners and manufacturers, for certain improvements in machinery or apparatus applicable to the spinning or twisting of cotton, flax, silk, wool, and other fibrous materials.

G. Royle, Walsall, Staffordshire, white-smith, for an improved method of making iron-pipes, tubes, or cylinders.

James Slater, Salford, co. Lancaster, bleacher, for certain improvements in the method of generating steam or vapour applicable as a moving power; and to arts and manufactures, and also for improvements in vessels or machinery employed for that purpose.

Thomas Coleman, St. Alban's, in the county of Hertford, training groom, for an improved roller for horses.

Andrew Ure, Finsbury-circus, in the county of Middlesex, M. D. for an improved apparatus for distilling.

Thomas Brunton, Park-square, Regent's-park, in the county of Middlesex, esq. for an improvement in certain apparatus rendering the same applicable to distilling (communicated by a foreigner).

John Wallace, Leith, brazier, for an improvement or improvements upon the safety-hearth for the use of vessels.

Thomas Brunton, Park-square, Regent's-park, in the county of Middlesex, esq. for an improvement in certain apparatus rendering the same applicable to steam-engines (communicated by a foreigner).

Samuel Morand, Manchester, in the county of Lancaster, merchant, for an improved stretching machine.

William Rutherford, jun. Jedburgh,

in that part of the United Kingdom called Scotland, writer and bank agent, for a combination or arrangement of apparatus or mechanism to be used by itself, or applied to locks and other fastenings, for more protecting property.

Thomas Brunton, Park-square, Regent's-park, in the county of Middlesex, esq. for an improvement in certain apparatus rendering the same applicable for making or refining sugar (communicated by a foreigner).

Thomas Gaunt, Chapman-street, Islington, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman; and George Frederick Eckstein, of Holborn, in the same county, stove and grate manufacturer, for an improved fire-grate.

William Dixon, Walsall, in the county of Stafford, brass-cock founder, for an improvement on the cock, or tap, applicable to fluids, liquids, and gases (communicated by a foreigner).

Joshua Taylor Beale, Church-lane, Whitechapel, in the county of Middlesex, engineer, for an improvement in certain apparatus for separating a portion of aqueous vapour from the vapour of alcohol, in the process of distilling and rectifying spirituous liquors.

George Stephenson, Liverpool, civil engineer, for an improvement in the mode of constructing wheels for railway carriages.

William Gutteridge, of the parish of St. John, Clerkenwell, in the county of Middlesex, civil engineer, for certain improvements in apparatus for distilling and other purposes.

Robert Burton Cooper, Battersea-fields, in the county of Surrey, esq. for an improvement or improvements on a cock, or tap, applicable to fluids, liquids, and gases, and for applying the said improvement or improvements to other useful purposes.

Joshua Proctor Westhead, Manchester, manufacturer, for certain improvements in the manufacture of small wares.

Thomas Knowles, Charlton-row, in the county of Lancaster, cotton spinner, for certain improvements in certain machinery, by aid of which machinery, machines commonly called mules are or may be rendered what is termed self-acting; that is to say, certain improvements in certain machinery, by aid of which machinery, spinning-machines, commonly called mules, are or may be worked by power, without requiring the usual application of strength of the spinners, to give motion to the



handles or wheels, and to such other parts of mules as are commonly worked by the strength of the spinners.

George Barnard, Bristol, builder, for certain improvements in locks, and other spring fastenings for doors, and other places.

Thomas Westrup and William Gibbins, both of Bromley, in the county of Middlesex, gentlemen, for improvements in converting salt or other water into pure or other water.

Richard Wood, New York, in the United States of America, but now of Bishopsgate-street-without, in the city of London, for an inking apparatus, to be used with certain descriptions of printing-presses.

Samuel Hobday, Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, steel snuffer and toy manufacturer, for a certain improvement in a machine to be worked by steam, that may be applied for the moving of ships' boats and barges on the water, and to carriages, either on the road or tram-ways, and in a fixed position may be applied to all the purposes that steam engines are now used for.

Richard Fell, Fountain-yard, Vauxhall-bridge-road, in the county of Middlesex, plumber, for improvements in machinery or apparatus for raising water, and in the application thereof to certain useful purposes.

Nicolas Hegesippe Manicler, 5, Union-road, Southwark, in the county of Surrey, chemist, and James Collier, Canal Grove, New Peckham, in the county of Kent, civil engineer, for a new manufacture of useful products from a certain oleaginous substance.

Samuel Lambert, Regent-street, St. James's, Westminster, in the county of Middlesex, gold laceman, for an improvement in throstle-spindles for spinning and twisting silk, cotton, wool, flax, and other fibrous substances.

Thomas Spinney, Cheltenham, in the county of Gloucester, gas engineer, for certain improvements in apparatus for manufacturing gas for illumination.

John Pearse, Tavistock, in the county of Devon, ironmonger, for certain improvements on wheeled carriages, and on apparatus to be used therewith.

Edward Newman Fourdrinier, Hanley, in the parish of Stoke-upon-Trent, in the county of Stafford, paper-maker, for a certain machine for an improved mode of cutting paper.

John Lee Stevens, auctioneer, and Peter Waycott, clock and watch maker,

both of Plymouth, in the county of Devon, for certain improvements in mangles.

Jacob Perkins, Fleet-street, in the city of London, engineer, for his improvement on his former patent, dated July 2, 1831; making the same applicable to the evaporating and boiling of fluids for certain purposes.

Benjamin Aingworth, in the parish of Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, button-maker, for an improvement in the making and constructing of buttons.

Jean Jaques Jaquier, Castle-street, Leicester-square, in the county of Middlesex, merchant, for improvements in the machinery for making paper (communicated by a foreigner).

Harrison Gray Dyar, Panton-square, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman, for an improvement in tunnelling, or method of executing subterraneous excavations.

George Forrester, Vauxhall foundry, Liverpool, in the county of Lancaster, civil engineer, for certain improvements in wheels for carriages and machinery, which improvements are applicable to other purposes.

William Bickford, Tuckingwill, in the county of Cornwall, leather-seller, for his invention of an instrument for igniting gunpowder, when used in the operation of blasting rocks and in mining.

George Holworthy Palmer, Manchester-street, Gray's Inn-road, civil engineer, for certain improvements in the steam-engine, boiler, and apparatus, or machinery connected therewith, applicable to propelling vessels, carriages, and other purposes.

James Neville, Great Dover-road, in the county of Surrey, engineer, for his improved apparatus for clarifying water and other fluids.

John Potts, Richard Oliver, and William Wainwright Potts, all of New Mills, in the county of Derby, engravers, for an improved method or process of obtaining impressions from engravings in various colours, and applying the same to earthenware, porcelain, china, glass, and other similar substances.

Sampson Mordant, Castle-street East, Finsbury, in the county of Middlesex, engineer, and William Brockedon of Devonshire-street, Queen-square, of the same county, esq., for certain improvements in the construction of writing-pens and penholders, in the method of using them.



Mark Cosnahan, Isle of Man, esq. for certain improvements in apparatus, modes, or process for converting sea or salt water, and also other brackish, turbid, or impure waters, into purified or fresh water; which apparatus, modes, or processes, or parts thereof, may be applied to other purposes.

Samuel Crosley, of Cottage-lane, City-road, in the county of Middlesex, gas meter manufacturer, for an improved gas meter.

Daniel Dunscomb Bradford, a citizen of the United States of North America, but now residing in Dorset-place in the parish of St. Marylebone, in the county of Middlesex, for an invention of certain improvements in lamps (communicated by Solomon Andrews, residing at Amboy, New Jersey, in the said United States of North America).

Peter Young, Fenchurch-street, in the city of London, rope and sail-maker, for an invention of a new mode of manufacturing mangel-wursel, for the purpose of producing various known articles of commerce (communicated by a foreigner).

John Christopher, of New Bond-street, in the city of London, merchant, for an improvement in clothes-buttons.

William Drake, Bedminster, near the city of Bristol, tanner, for an improvement or improvements in tanning hides and skins.

George Low, Brick-lane, in the parish of St. Luke's, Old-street, in the county of Middlesex, civil engineer, for an improvement or improvements in, and connected with, the manufacture of gas for illumination.

William Hale, Colchester, in the county of Essex, machinist, for improvements in machinery, or apparatus for propelling vessels, which improvements are also applicable for raising or forcing fluids.

William Ainsworth Jump, Marston, in the county of Chester, gentleman, for certain improvements in drawing or extracting salt from salt-pans.

John Smith and William Dolier, both of Liverpool, gentlemen, for a durable copy-book, or writing-tablet, and improved delible ink, to be used therewith.

John Cowderoy, Britannia-street, Hoxton New-road, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman, for certain improvements in machinery, or apparatus to be used in the process of making or manufacturing bread and biscuits.

Thomas Henry Pollard, Park-street,

Grosvenor-square, in the county of Middlesex, estate and house agent, for certain improvements in chimneys, by the application of a mechanical apparatus as a smoke-conductor.

William Godfrey Kneller, Hackney, in the county of Middlesex, esq., for certain improvements on stills, or apparatus for distilling.

Jacob Perkins, Fleet-street, in the city of London, engineer, for improvements in generating steam.

Baron Charles Wetterstedt, White-chapel-road, in the county of Middlesex, for a composition or combination of materials for sheathing, painting, or preserving ship bottoms, and for other purposes.

Robert Hicks, Wimpole-street, in the county of Middlesex, surgeon, for certain improvements in culinary apparatus.

Adolphe Jacquesson, Leicester-square, in the county of Middlesex, esq., for certain improvements in machinery applicable to lithographic and other printing (communicated by a foreigner).

Richard Prosser, Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, civil engineer, for certain improvements in manufacturing nails or tacks, for ornamenting boxes and articles of furniture.

John Milne, Shaw, in the parish of Oldham, in the county of Lancaster, cotton spinner, for improvements on certain instruments or machines, commonly called roving-frames, and slubbing-frames, used for preparing cotton wool for spinning.

Moses Poole, Lincoln's Inn, in the county of Middlesex, gentleman, for certain improvements in steam-engines, and in propelling boats and other floating bodies, parts of which improvements are applicable to other purposes (communicated by a foreigner).

Augustus Demondion, Old Fish-street Hill, in the city of London, for certain improvements on guns, muskets, and other fire-arms, and in cartridges to be used therewith, and method of priming the same: and in the machinery for making the said guns, muskets, and fire-arms; also the cartridges and priming; which improvements are also applicable to other purposes (communicated by a foreigner).

James Pycroft, Rolleston, near Burton-on-Trent, Staffordshire, gentleman, for certain improvements connected with grates and other fire-places.

Sampson Mordan, Castle-street East,



Finsbury, in the county of Middlesex, engineer, for certain improvements in writing and drawing-pens and penholders, and in the method of using them.

William Batten, Rochester, in the county of Kent, gentleman, for an apparatus for checking or stopping chain cables, which apparatus may be applied to other purposes.

John de Burgh, marquis of Clanricarde, for certain improvements in fire-arms, and in the projectiles to be used therewith (communicated by a foreigner).

William Allen, Catharine-st., Strand, in the county of Middlesex, piano-forte maker, for certain improvements upon piano-fortes.

Henry Lister Maw, South Molton-street, in the county of Middlesex, lieutenant in our royal navy, for an improved method of using fuel so as to burn smoke.

John Bauce, Moscow-cottages, Bayswater, in the parish of Paddington, and county of Middlesex, gentleman, for an improvement in the construction of heads or hoods for cabriolets, gigs, or other open carriages, whereof the heads or hoods are required to fold down behind the back of the seat when out of use (communicated by a foreigner).

John Young, Wolverhampton, in the county of Stafford, locksmith, for certain improvements on locks and latches, with regard to the security of the same, and the construction of the interior and exterior parts thereof.

Marmaduke Robinson, Great George-street, in the city of Westminster, navy agent, on behalf of William Augustus Archball, esq., a lieutenant in the royal navy, at present residing at Louisiana, in the United States of America, for certain improvements in the making and purifying of sugars (communicated by the said William Augustus Archball, esq.).

William Church, Heywood-house, Bordsley-green, Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, gentleman, for certain improvements in machinery for making nails.

Angier March Perkins, Harper-street, in the county of Middlesex, civil engineer, for certain improvements in the apparatus or method of heating air in buildings, heating and evaporating fluids, and heating metals.

Sir James Caleb Anderson, Bultevant Castle, in the county of Cork, Ireland, baronet, for certain improved machinery for propelling vessels on water, which

machinery is applicable to other useful purposes.

John Hall, the younger, Dartford, in the county of Kent, engineer, for an improvement in machinery used in the manufacture of paper (communicated by a foreigner).

Jean Marie Etienne Ardit, Newman-street, Oxford-street, in the county of Middlesex, printer, for a machine or apparatus for drawing, and for copying and reducing drawings and other objects or subjects, and for taking panoramas (communicated by a foreigner).

Alexander Cochrane, Norton-street, Great Portland-street, in the county of Middlesex, esq., for certain improvements in machinery for propelling or moving locomotive carriages, and giving motion to mills and other machinery.

William Mason, Margaret-street, Cavendish-square in the county of Middlesex, patent axle-tree maker, for certain improvements in the construction of wheeled carriages.

David Selden, Liverpool, in the county Palatine of Lancaster, merchant, for certain improvements in metallic mills for grinding coffee, corn, drugs, paints, and various other materials (communicated by a foreigner).

Augustus Whiting Gillet, Birmingham, in the county of Warwick, merchant, for a new or improved machine, or instrument, to measure, beat, and give the accents in all the different moods of time, with any degree of velocity required, applicable to the teaching of music (communicated by a foreigner).

Andrew Ure, of Finsbury-square, in the parish of St. Luke's in the county of Middlesex, doctor in medicine, for an improved apparatus for evaporating syrups and saccharine juices.

William Bingham, St. Mary-hall, esq., and William Dupe, gunmaker, both of Oxford, for certain improvements on fire-arms of different descriptions.

Henry Hope Wernick, of North-terrace, Camberwell, in the county of Surrey, gentleman, for improvements on apparatus or methods for preserving lives of persons and property when in danger by shipwreck, by speedily converting boats, or small vessels of ordinary description into life-boats, and other apparatus or means applicable to the same objects (communicated by a foreigner).

James Lang, of Greenock, Scotland, North Britain, flax-dresser, for certain improvements in machinery for spread-



ing, drawing, roving, or spinning flax, hemp, and other fibrous substances, dressed or undressed.

Joseph Gillot, Birmingham, in the co. of Warwick, steel pen-maker, for an improvement in the making or manufacturing of metallic pens.

John Myatt, Tabernacle walk, Finsbury-square, in the co. of Middlesex, tailor, for his invention of an article to be worn on the feet as a substitute for pattens or clogs, which he denominates Myatt's Health Preserver.

Oliver St. George, Great Cumberland-street, in the co. of Middlesex, esq., for certain improvements in machinery for acquiring power in tides or currents (communicated by a foreigner).

Miles Berry, of the office for patents, 66, Chancery-lane, in the parish of St.

Andrew's, Holborn, in the co. of Middlesex, engineer and mechanical draftsman, for certain improvements in the boilers, or generators of steam, or other vapour, and in engines to be worked by steam or vapour, for propelling or actuating machinery on land, and vessels, or other floating bodies on water, and also in the mode of condensing such steam or vapour (communicated by M. Jean Nicholas, Senéchal, Ingenieur des Ponts et Chause, residing at Versailles, in France).

John Heathcoat, Tiverton, in the co. of Devon, lace-manufacturer, for certain improvements in the machinery used for making of bobbin, or twist lace net, whereby not and other fabrics may be produced.



# P O E T R Y.

---

## PARENTAL LOVE.

[*From Framlingham, a Poem, by James Bird.*]

OH! ye, who feel that dear parental glow,  
The holiest transport of the soul below!  
Ye, who have watched with anxious care and duty  
A daughter's youth, the opening bud of beauty  
Spread fair and fairer, while the heart beat high  
With pride, a parent's fond infirmity,  
When that dear child is as an angel left  
To glad your age, of many joys bereft,  
Say, is not all the alluring world can give,  
The hopes long perished, and the hopes that live,  
The busy day-dreams, visions of the night,  
The pangs of woe, the raptures of delight,  
Are they not *all*, the placid and the wild,  
Lost in the love for that endearing child?

---

## EVENING.

[*From the Same.*]

STILL lingered twilight with her blush serene,  
Still from the ramparts, on the varied scene  
Gazed SCHEMYNG with his friends—the landscape bright  
Spread far beneath them—valleys of delight  
And wood-crowned hills appeared—and there with grace  
Huge oaks, the loftiest of their lofty race,  
Reared their proud heads o'er upland and o'er vale:  
Records of ages!—the inconstant gale  
Greets, in its pilgrimage from land to land  
No forest-kings so beautiful, so grand!  
And HELEN felt the witchery of that hour,  
To which deep silence gave a holier power  
To charm the heart, for e'en the stream below  
So softly lapsed, the music of its flow  
Woke not the echoes of the hills around.

---

## NIGHT.

[*From the Same.*]

“NIGHT!—thy glittering gems, so fair,  
Are smiling mild, and bright above us!  
Thought forsakes the world of care,  
And fondly flies to those who love us!  
Solemn Night!—to thee belong  
The holiest spells of the Poet's song!



In thy deep, calm, and silent hour  
 Springs the soul on heaven-ward pinion,  
 Aloft, to boundless worlds of power,  
 Far above proud man's dominion ;  
 Worlds, to which *his* strength, his thought,  
 Hopes, fears, and passions are as nought !

Night ! thy planetary host  
 Sail on thy blue ethereal ocean,  
 Light barques upon a rockless coast,  
 Gliding with unruffled motion !  
 Led by one unerring might,  
 Wisdom of the realms of light !

Grand is Night's unheeded time !  
 Sons of Earth !—awake from slumber !  
 Mark the trackless orbs, sublime,  
 Bright without change, or end, or number !  
 Types of a page which, if we scan,  
 How great is God !—how weak is Man !

And when thick darkness spreads her wings  
 O'er heaven, and land, and sea, appalling,  
 Wraps in deep gloom all earthly things,  
 As though the angry skies were falling !  
 Awe-struck, the soul then owns the might  
 Of power unseen—the infinite !

Oh ! thou, who spread'st the lofty sky !  
 Of whom each star the wisdom telleth,  
 When Night reveals the worlds on high,  
 Above whose track thy glory dwelleth !  
 Oh ! guide us by thy hallowed light,  
 Our sun by day—our lamp by night !”

---

### SPRING HYMN.

[*From the Winter's Wreath. By DELTA.*]

How pleasant is the opening year !  
 The clouds of winter melt away ;  
 The flowers in beauty re-appear ;  
 The songsters carol from the spray ;  
 Lengthens the more refulgent day,  
 And bluer grows the arching sky ;  
 All things around us seem to say,  
 “ Christian ! direct thy thoughts on high.”

In darkness, through the dreary length  
 Of winter, slept both bud and bloom ;  
 But nature now puts forth her strength,  
 And starts, renewed, as from the tomb ;



Behold an emblem of thy doom,  
 O Man ! a star hath shone to save,  
 And morning yet shall re-illumine  
 The midnight darkness of the grave !  
 Yet ponder well how then shall break  
 The dawn of second life on thee—  
 Shalt thou to hope, to bliss awake ?  
 Or vainly strive God's wrath to flee ?  
 Then shall pass forth the dread decree,  
 That makes or weal or woe thy own ;  
 Up and to work—Eternity  
 Must reap the harvest Time hath sown.

NAPLES :—THE SONG OF THE SYREN.

[*From the Same.* By MRS. HEMANS.]

STILL is the Syren warbling on thy shore,  
 Bright City of the Waves !—her magic song  
 Still with a dreamy sense of extasy  
 Fills thy soft summer air : and while my glance  
 Dwells on thy pictured loveliness, that lay  
 Floats thus o'er Fancy's ear ; and thus to thee,  
 Daughter of Sunshine ! doth the Syren sing :

“ Thine is the glad wave's flashing play,  
 Thine is the laugh of the golden day,  
 The golden day and the glorious night,  
 And the vine with its clusters all bathed in light !  
 Forget, forget, that thou art not free !

Queen of the summer sea !

“ Favoured and crowned of the earth and the sky !  
 Thine are all voices of melody,  
 Wandering in moonlight through fane and tower,  
 Floating o'er fountain and myrtle bower ;  
 Hark ! now they melt o'er thy glittering sea ;

Forget that thou art not free !

“ Let the wine flow in thy marble halls !  
 Let the lute answer thy fountain falls !  
 And deck thy beach with the myrtle bough,  
 And cover with roses thy glowing brow !

Queen of the day and the summer sea,  
 Forget that thou art not free !”

So doth the Syren sing, while sparkling waves  
 Dance to her chaunt.—But sternly, mournfully,  
 O city of the deep, from Sybil grots  
 And Roman tombs, the echoes of thy shore  
 Take up the cadence of her strain alone  
 Murmuring—“ Thou art not free !”



## YOUTH.

[*From the Same.* By W. HOWITT.]

Oh ! beautiful is youth !  
How often as it passes by  
With flowing limbs and flashing eye,  
With soul that not a care has cross'd,  
With cheek that not a tint has lost ;—  
How often in my heart I cry,  
How beautiful is youth !

Sweet youth ! sweet youth ! no need  
Hast thou of such a mould,  
Of such an air as sculptors old  
On god or goddess cast—that thrilled,  
With life, with thought, with beauty filled !  
In simplest forms thy power is shown,  
Thou sweet, almighty youth !

Oh generous youth ! thy gifts  
How freely are they thrown !  
What humble creature has not known  
The radiant eye's all-liquid light,  
The skin's pure freshness soft and bright,  
The glittering locks, the joyous tone ?  
Oh happy ! happy youth !

And yet thou art to me  
A melancholy sound !  
At once thy name doth bring around  
The fairest forms, the dearest things,  
The hours that took the spirit's wings,  
Words—places—brightness that hath found  
A memory sad and dark.

Oh youth ! had I no hope  
To share thy good once more,  
Methinks I should despise the lore,  
The garner'd thought, the wisdom deep,  
In which dim age the soul would steep,  
The fruit which proves the flower is o'er—  
And worship thee with tears.

But, blessings on a golden faith !  
I see the everlasting hour  
When back thou com'st in all thy power ;  
With friends and freedom, joy and grace,  
With blessings from each time and place,  
Life, love, and thou our triple dower—  
Oh happy—happy youth !



# I N D E X.

[N. B. The Figures within crotchets refer to the History.]

- ABERNETHY Mr.**, death, 235
- Abstract of the Reform Bill**, 336
- Acts of parliament**, list of, 279
- Accidents**: one on the Liverpool and Manchester railway, 22; fourteen persons drowned, 65; a man caught in a mill and turned round for about an hour, 65; collision of the "Venus" and "Firefly" steamers, 69; two lads killed by lightning, 70; nine persons killed at the Colbrook Vale iron-works, 76; bursting of a steam-boiler in the Custom-house, Liverpool, 102; Magdalen tower, Oxford, struck by lightning, 103; engineer and firemen killed on the Bolton railway, 110; a barge run down by the Pluto steam-boat, and three persons drowned, 120; five persons drowned on the Thames, 123; loss of the "Rothsay Castle" steam-packet and passengers, 129; railway accident, 181; explosion of gunpowder in a laboratory at Gibraltar, 189
- Althorp**, lord, his speech on the Reform Bill, [20]; his plan of the budget, [125]; his character of the general tendency of the Reform bill, [243]
- America**: see *Brazil, Canada, Columbia, Mexico, Peru, United States.*
- American Society**, 437; servants, 438; camp-meeting described, 439
- Antiquities**: relics of Caledonian Aborigines found, 139; ruins of an ancient city (Palenque) discovered in central America, 158
- Antwerp**, riots at, [388]; breach of neutrality on the part of the Belgic troops, [392]
- Appleby**, borough of, included in schedule A, by mistake, [166]; counsel not permitted to be heard in its favour, *ib.*; discussion as to its being disfranchised, [179]; majority in favour of that measure, [183]
- Army**, motion brought forward by ministers to increase it, [145]; opposed by Mr. Hunt, [147]; but carried, [148]
- Arson**, trial for, 3
- Ashton**, Mr. T. of Hyde, murder of, and inquest on, 7
- Assault**, case of, *Williams v. Hall*, 83
- Assizes and Sessions**:—
- Aylesbury*: *Wells v. Hood*, shooting a dog, 43
- Bury St. Edmund's*: *W. Offord*, murder, 107
- Cambridge*: *W. Smith, G. Baxter*, and *W. Markham*, burglary, 104
- Coventry*: *Mary Ann Higgins*, poisoning her uncle, 124
- Durham*: *T. Clarke*, murder of *Mary Ann Westropp*, 40; *S. Marden*, stealing a fur tippet, *ib.*
- Dorchester*: *J. Nobbs*, attempt to poison his infant son, 106
- Ennis*: *T. Reilly*, cutting out the tongues of *L. and T. Doyle*, 105
- Kingston*: *James Warner*, setting fire to *Mr. Woak's mill*, 3
- Lancaster*: *Entwistle v. Norcliffe*, false imprisonment, 46; *Moses Fernely*, murdering his infant stepson, 54; *T. and J. Fulvey*, murder of *C. Burn*, 55; *A. and W. Worrall, &c.*, murder, 56
- Lincoln*: *J. Greenwood*, burglary, 48; *M. Lundy*, murder of *T. Sowards*, 51
- Meath*: *M. Riley and C. Courtney*, conspiracy, 48
- Old Bailey*: *R. Carlile*, seditious publication, 18; *Mr. St. John Long*, causing the death of *Mrs. Lloyd* by improper medical treatment, 34; *Bishop, Williams, and May*, murder, 316.
- Salisbury*: *C. Giles*, murdering his infant child, 53
- Surrey*: *Rev. R. Taylor*, blasphemy, 93
- Taunton*: *T. Searle*, attempting to kill his daughter, 63
- Winchester*: *J. Sanson*, setting fire to farming buildings, 44
- York*: *Esther Dyson*, deaf and dumb woman, murdering her infant, 59; the *King v. Pearce, &c.*, nuisance occasioned by the *Stockton and Darlington railway*, 62; *D. and P. Simpson*, sheep stealing, 103
- Attwood**, Mr., his speech on the reform bill, [70]; considers the present system of representation satisfactory in operation if not in theory, *ib.*; objects to the new one as tending to demo-



# I N D E X.

- cracy, [71]; points out the ill effects of the French chambers, [72]
- Barbadoes, dreadful hurricane at, 127
- Barbarity, atrocious instance of, cutting out two men's tongues, 105
- Belgium: various candidates for the crown, [373]; France objects to the Duke of Leuchtenberg, [374]; arguments against such a choice, [377]; the duke of Nemours elected after the previous refusal in his name, [378]; the congress elects a regent, on the refusal being persisted in, [379]; terms of separation from Holland arranged by the conference at London, [380]; dissatisfaction of the congress, [384]; the regent calls upon the duchy of Luxemburg to throw off its allegiance to Holland, [387]; tumults of the populace in different places, [388]; attempt at negotiations with the Dutch government, [392]; hostilities on the part of the Belgian troops, at Antwerp, *ib.*; prince Leopold elected king, [396]; he accepts the crown, [399]; new preliminaries of a treaty between Belgium and Holland, *ib.*; arrival of Leopold, [404]; the king of Holland commences hostilities, [405]; the Belgians routed, [406]; they receive assistance from France, [407]; suspension of hostilities, [410]; Leopold's speech at opening of congress, *ib.*; new conditions proposed by the conference, [413]; treaty concluded between Belgium and the conference, against which the king of Holland protests, [415]; protocols and documents relative to the separation of Belgium and Holland, 361; articles of a definitive treaty with Holland, 395; speech of king Leopold on opening the congress, 403
- Berry, Sir E., death, 228
- Bilderdijk, Dutch poet, death, 261
- Birmingham; St. Peter's Church destroyed by fire, 21
- Bishop, Williams, and May, trial of, for murder for the purpose of selling the bodies, 316; confessions of the two former, 327; their execution, 335
- Blaudford, riot at, 164
- Blasphemy, trial of the Rev. R. Taylor for, 93
- Blood, Mr., of Applevale, county Clare, murder of, [29], 90
- Bolivar, death of, [464], 217
- Bologna: insurrection at, [452]. See *Italy*
- Boroughs; (see *Reform*.) Sir R. Peel's defence of close boroughs, [47]; Mr. Pitt's doctrine respecting disfranchising boroughs, [52]; anomalies in the reform bill with regard to the franchise of boroughs, [61]; discussions on disfranchisement of Appleby, Downton, &c., [178]. See *Parliament*.
- Brazil: state of political affairs, [460]; dispute between the two chambers of Congress, [461]; Donna Maria established as Queen of Portugal at Rio Janeiro, [462]; disturbances at ditto *ib.*; the chamber of deputies complains to the emperor, *ib.*; the latter abdicates in favour of his son, [463]; and proceeds with his daughter to Europe, *ib.*; the chamber appoints a regency, *ib.*; popular tumults, [464]
- Bridge, the New London, ceremony of opening, 116
- Bristol, dreadful riots at, occasioned by the arrival of sir C. Wetherell, the recorder, [292], 172; the mansion-house plundered and burnt, 174; bishop's palace burnt, 176; total amount of buildings destroyed, *ib.*
- Brown, Mather, artist, death, 242
- Brougham, lord, questions the right of the house of peers to inflict fine for breach of privilege, [119]
- Brunswick: accession of duke William in place of his brother, [420]
- Buchanan, lieut. commander of the Pluto steam boat, court martial on, for running down a barge, 122
- Budget, the, [125]; proposed reduction of taxes, *ib.*; See *Taxes*.
- Buenos Ayres, events at, [464]
- Burdett, sir F. considers single representation the better mode, [204]; withdraws from the National Political Union, 296
- Burglary, Mr. Hill's house robbed at Gartloch, 14
- Calcraft, right hon. J., suicide of, 155; account of, 256
- Calais, regulations relative to vessels from Scotland, &c. 183
- Cambridge, attempt by a student to blow up the letter box at the post office, 190
- Canada, proposed increase on duty of timber from, [136]; injurious effects of this measure to that colony, [137]; increase of exports to it, [138]
- Capo d'Istrias, President of Greece, assassinated, [459]; 160
- Carlisle, Richard, trial of, for sedition, 18
- Carpenter, W., criminal information



# I N D E X.

- against, for his attempt to evade the Stamp duty in the publication of his "Political Letter," 74
- Carr, Rev. W. Holwell, death, 218
- Carrington, N. T. death, 216
- Chandos, marquis of, moves that tenants at will be admitted to vote for counties, which is carried, [214]
- China, rupture between the English factory and the natives, at Canton, 182
- Chippenham, borough of, inaccuracy in the return of its population, [197]
- Cholera, progress of in India, &c., [298]; its first appearance in England, [299]; its progress on the continent, [436]; its ravages at St. Petersburg, [437]; it reaches Berlin, Hamburg, &c., *ib.*; mortality in Hungary and Egypt, [438]; statement relative to the disease published by the Board of Health, 166; symptoms, &c., *ib.*; instructions and regulations issued by the Privy Council, 357
- Christie, James, death, 223
- Church rates, case relative to, 186
- Civil List, new arrangement respecting, [141]; alteration of the pension lists, *ib.*; plan for the future reduction of pensions, [142]
- Cobbett, Mr., trial of, for sedition, 95
- Columbia: death of Bolivar, [464]; his last address to the citizens, [465]; insurrection in Panama, [466]
- Condè, prince of, his will, 195
- Constantine, grand duke, death, 246
- Constantinople, destructive fire in Pera, 118
- Cornwall, riot of miners, 33
- Coronation of William IV., and Queen Adelaide, 140
- Coronation robes, George IV. sale of, 81
- Corporation Franchises, asserted to be intangible, [27]; the contrary doctrine maintained by Mr. Pitt, [36]
- Counties, clause in the Reform bill relative to dividing them into districts for returning members, discussed, [209]; tenants at will admitted to vote, [214]
- Courts:
- Admiralty*: Blakeney Pilots *v.* The "City of Edinburgh," for salvage, 19
- Common Pleas*: Kelsey *v.* Burnett, flogging aboard ship, 31
- Consistory Court*: Conway *v.* Beazley, nullity of marriage, 109
- Exchequer*: Williams *v.* Hall, assault, 83; Fluke *v.* Duke, recovery of price of stamps for attorneys' clerks' articles, 86
- Guildhall*: The King *v.* Cobbett, se i-tion, 95
- High Court of Justiciary, Edinburgh*: Rev.—M'Caig, stealing books, 79; trial of M'Lauchlan, &c., rioting at Lauder, 184; J. Barnet, &c. rioting at Dundee, 307; A. Graham, &c. rioting at Haddington, 310; R. Forrester, rioting at Edinburgh, 311; S. Waugh and J. Ramsay, murder, 313
- King's Bench*: Paul *v.* Hardwick, warranty of a horse, 25; Walker *v.* Lushington, M. P. and others, 27; Howe *v.* Daubeny, libel, 87; the king on behalf of M. Scales, *v.* the Lord Mayor and corporation of London, 185; Colburn *v.* Harvey, parish rates, 186
- Court Martial on lieutenant Buchanan, &c. of the "Pluto" steam-boat, 122
- Coventry, riot at, 177
- Crampton, Mr., Solicitor-general for Ireland, contends that it is in the power of the crown virtually to disfranchise decayed boroughs by withholding writs from them [239]
- Croker, Mr., his speech on, and objections to the reform bill, [59]; on the conduct of ministers with regard to Appleby, [180]; reply to Mr. Macaulay, [230]
- Cruelty to a pauper in Cripplegate work-house, 137
- Davies, colonel, proposes as an amendment that freeholders in boroughs should not vote for counties, [217]
- Dean Forest, riot at, [281]; 82
- Declaration of the merchants of London, against the reform bill, [81]
- Delvig, baron, Russian writer, death of, 222
- Derby, riot at, 161
- Diebitsch, Russian field-marshal, death, 244
- Downton, borough of, discussion as to its disfranchisement, [184]; which is finally carried [186]
- Dublin, the procession of the trades prevented by a proclamation, [304] see *Ireland* and *O'Connell*
- Duel between general Sebastiani and general Lamarque, 138
- Dundee, illumination and riot at, 61; trials of some of the rioters, 307
- Duppa, Mr., death, 250
- Durham, prospectus of a new University at, 194
- Earthquake in the province of Basilicata, Naples, 4



# I N D E X.

- Ebrington, lord, his motion to prevent ministers from resigning on the rejection of the reform bill by the Lords, [277]
- Edinburgh, illumination and rioting at, 60; conservative meeting, 186; trial of Ralph Forrester, one of the rioters, 311; violence displayed towards the lord Provost, 312
- Eldon, lord, his speech against the reform bill, [268]
- Election, the general, [149]; candidates obliged to promise unconditional support of the reform bill, [151]; popular violence at elections in many places, [152]
- Elections, regulations relative to the registration of electors, &c. 223
- Elliston, R. W., actor, death, 248
- Execution, J. A. Bell, aged 14, for murder of another boy, 114; Bishop and Williams, 335
- Felony, extraordinary charge of, 184
- Fires: Greenwich theatre burnt, 19; St. Peter's, Birmingham, destroyed, 21; fire in Sermon-lane, Doctors' Commons, 64; at lord Walsingham's, and death of his lordship and her ladyship, 67; destructive fire at Pera, Constantinople, 118: a number of warehouses destroyed at Liverpool, 193
- Foster, captain, death, 225
- Franchise, projected alteration of [10]; the plan proposed by the reform bill censured by Mr. Croker, [61] anomaly discovered in the proposed 10*l.* franchise, [162]; amendment that the rent be not paid oftener than quarterly [219]; which is negatived, [222]; existing rights of franchise considered *ib.*
- France: state of parties, [329]; conflicting opinions regarding Belgium, &c. [330]; tumults among the students at Paris, [333]; serious riots occasioned by the celebration of the anniversary of the Duc de Berri, *ib.*; crosses taken down from the churches, [334]; reluctance of the government to punish these excesses, [335]; resignation of ministers, [337]; M. Perrier declares his determination to put down irregular power, [338]; an association formed against the Bourbons, [339]; bill brought in by the new ministry to prevent riotous assemblages, [340]; tumults at Paris, *ib.*; the new electoral law, [341]; the budget, [343]; subscription in lieu of a loan, *ib.*; king's speech at the close of the Session, [344]; his tour through the eastern departments, [347]; turbulent state of the capital, [348]; capture of the Portuguese fleet, [350]; king's speech on opening the Session, [351]; celebration of the revolution of 1831, [354]; affair of the Austrian standards, *ib.*; contest at the election of the president of the 'Chamber,' [355]; an army dispatched to the assistance of Belgium, [357]; declarations of the ministry against the movement party, [359]; bill for abolishing the hereditary peerage, [361]; which is carried by an increase of peers, [367]; reports of Carlist conspiracies. [368]; insurrection at Lyons, [369]; Louis Philippe objects to the crown of Belgium being given to the duke of Leuchtenberg, [374]; declines it for his son, the duke of Nemours, [375]; rejects it again after he has been elected, [379]; military force of France in 1831, 157
- Funds, proposed tax on transfers in, [128]; violent opposition to the measure, [131]; defended by Mr. C. Grant and sir J. Wrottesley, [133]; Mr. Pitt's authority for taxing fundholders quoted, *ib.*; difference between such a tax and that on transfers of land, [134]; the measure abandoned by ministers, [135]
- Gambles, captain H., of the Lady Sherbrooke, tried for wrecking the vessel, and occasioning the deaths of 273 persons, 156
- Gascoyne, general, moves an amendment to the Reform bill, that the number of members for England ought not to be diminished, [104]
- Gateshead, opposition to its being made one of the new boroughs, [205]
- Gibraltar, explosion of gunpowder at, 189
- Glasgow, flood at, 30
- Gottingen, insurrection at, and provisional government formed, [418]; deputation to the duke of Cambridge, [419]; the government troops admitted into the city, [420]
- Graham, sir James, justifies the disfranchisement proposed by the Reform bill, [72]; vindicates the plan of ministers from Mr. Croker's insinuations, *ib.*
- Grant, Mr. C., his speech on the Reform question, [89]
- Grant, Mr. R., his arguments in favour of reform, [65], [239]
- Greatorex, T., musician, death, 250



# I N D E X.

- Greece : unpopularity of the president, Capo d'Istrias, [457] ; insurrection, *ib.* ; the provisional government attempt to seize the fleet at Poros, [458] ; Poros attacked by the Russian troops, *ib.* ; Hydra destroyed by Capo d'Istrias' troops, *ib.* ; the Russian fleet attacked by the Hydriots, [459] ; Capo d'Istrias assassinated, and his brother Augustin placed at the head of a committee of government, *ib.*
- Greenwich, discussion relative to its proposed representation in parliament, [198] ; sir R. Peel's arguments against it, [199] ; the theatre burnt, 19
- Grey, lord, his speech on the Reform bill, [254]
- Grimsby election, action for libel, imputing unfair conduct to the Red party, 87
- Haddington, riots at, and trial of some of the mob, 310
- Hall, rev. R., death, 228
- Hanover, insurrections in, [417] ; provisional government established by the rebels at Gottingen, [418]
- Hart, sir A., late lord chancellor of Ireland, death, 259
- Hemans, Mrs., 'Naples : the Syren's Song,' 455
- Hesse Cassel, disturbances in, [420]
- Hobhouse, Mr., his speech in favour of Reform bill, [35]
- Hobhouse, sir Benjamin. death, 252
- Holland (see *Belgium*) : the armistice with Belgium broken off, [405] ; the Dutch army, under the prince of Orange, enter Belgium, [406] ; its successes stopped only by the advance of French troops to the assistance of Belgium, [407] ; the king determines to act upon the defensive, after the treaty between the Belgians and the Five Powers, [415] ; documents relative to its separation from Belgium, 361 ; correspondence with the Conference relative to the entry of Dutch troops into Belgium, 384 ; king's speech at opening of the States General, 405
- Hope, Thomas, death and memoir, 224
- Horse, warranty of one, action relative to, 25
- Horsemanship, remarkable feats and matches, 181
- Houses, rated to the house-tax, number of, in England and Wales, 294
- Howe, earl, dismissed from the office of queen's chamberlain, [280], 165
- Hume, Mr., moves for a reduction in the allowances to the royal dukes, [145]
- Hunt, Mr., presses for a division, on the motion for increasing the army, [148] ; his amendment on the clause relative to the 10% franchise, [216]
- Hunt, T. F., architect, death, 237
- Hurricane, dreadful one at Barbadoes, &c., 127
- Huskisson, Mr., his opinion against parliamentary reform, quoted, [35]
- Jackson, J., portrait painter, death, 242
- Jeffrey, Mr., lord advocate of Scotland ; his maiden speech in parliament, in support of the Reform bill, [54]
- Illuminations, at Edinburgh, and riot, 60 ; ditto, ditto, at Dundee, 61 ; in London, and riotous conduct, 69
- Inquests, coroners : Mr. Thos. Ashton, shot, 7 ; W. Crittenden and G. Herold, seamen, killed by smugglers, 8 ; lord Rivers, drowned in the Serpentine, 21 ; M. Lynch, a watchman, at Dublin, 33 ; Miss Harris, death from wearing tight stays, 66 ; lord and lady Walsingham, 67 ; sir Joseph Yorke, capt. Bradby, and capt. Yonge, drowned, 72 ; Mary Clarke, 77 ; J. Hughes, one of the rioters at Merthyr Tydvil, 84 ; P. Glendining, &c., drowned, 120 ; five persons drowned on the Thames, 123 ; Eliz. Cooper, pauper in Cripplegate work-house, 137 ; J. Calcraft, M. P. 155
- Inglis, sir R. H., his speech on the Reform bill, [15]
- Inundations : at Glasgow, 30 ; at Perth, 31 ; floods of the Tweed and Teviot, *ib.*
- Ireland : proposed change in its representation, [13] ; the bill brought in by Mr. Stanley, [96] ; additional members proposed to be given to it, [97] ; preponderance thereby given to the Catholics, [99] ; lawless state of the peasantry, [300] ; circular from the government to magistrates, [301] ; extreme distress in Mayo, [302] ; efforts of the agitators to obtain a repeal of the Union, [303] ; O'Connell's procession prohibited, [304] ; he and other agitators apprehended, [312] ; true bills found against them, [314] (see *O'Connell*) ; explanation given in the House of Commons by the Irish secretary relative to the conduct of government towards O'Connell, [317] ; disinclination to a repeal of the Union occasioned by O'Connell's proceedings, [320] ; declaration made against the repeal by ministers, in parliament, [322] ; popular outrages in Clare, &c., [324] ; many of the police murdered by the populace at Newton-barry, [326] ; Protestant meeting at Dublin, 190 ; a process-server and several of



# INDEX.

- the police massacred at Carrickshock, *ib.*
- Jodrell, R. P., death, 221
- Jones, captain G. M., death, 237.
- Irving, rev. Mr., pretended inspiration among his congregation, 187
- Italy: election of Gregory 18th, [451]; attempts on the part of the French to excite conspiracies, *ib.*; conspiracy at Modena, *ib.*; insurrection at Bologna, [452]; also at Parma, [453]; a provisional government formed, *ib.*; restoration of the governments of Modena and Parma, [454]; the Austrians enter Bologna, and the papal government re-established, [455]; cardinal Benvenuti detained a prisoner by the rebels at Ancona, *ib.*; the papal state divided into delegations by the pope, [456]; death of the king of Sardinia, [457]
- Izmailov, Russian fabulist, death, 222.
- Kennedy, general, death, 255
- King's speech on proroguing parliament, [114]; at the meeting of the new Parliament, [155]
- Koslovsky, composer, death, 231
- Kreutzer, R., violinist, death, 225
- La Fontaine, German novelist, death, 235
- Lawson, Mr., printer of *The Times*, brought up to answer for a libellous paragraph in that paper, 117; see *Times*.
- Lee, professor, account of, 160
- Leopold, prince of Saxe-Coburg, the crown of Belgium offered to him, [391]; a deputation arrives in London, [397]; he accepts the crown, [399]
- Libel, action for, against Dr. Lushington and the publishers of the *Mirror of Parliament*, 27; *Howe v. Daubeney*, unfair proceedings at Grimsby election, 87
- Life-buoy, account of the one now in use 444
- Lightning, deaths by, 70
- Limerick, earl of, complains of the aspersions thrown out against him by *The Times*, as a breach of privilege, [117]: see *Times*.
- Lists, ministers, 196  
House of Commons, 197  
Sheriffs, 201  
Births, 202  
Marriages, 204  
Promotions, 210  
Deaths, 216  
General acts, 279, 284  
Local acts, 280, 286
- Liverpool, bursting of a steam-boiler in the new custom-house, 102; violent storm, 128; destructive fire, 193
- Livonia, present state of the peasantry in, 432
- London-bridge, the new, ceremony of opening, 116
- London, bishop of, obliged to abandon his purpose of preaching at St. Ann's, Soho, 167
- Londonderry, marquis of, attacked in St. James's Park, by the mob, 163
- Lopes, sir M., death, 232
- Lords, House of, how affected by reform, [245], [256]; debate in, on the reform bill, [254] See *Parliament*.
- Lyndhurst, lord, his speech against the reform bill [271]
- Lyons, insurrection at, [369]; success of the insurgents, [370]; the arrival of the duke of Orleans and marshal Soult restores tranquillity, [371]
- Leuchtenberg, duke of (son of Eugene Beauharnois,) proposed as king of Belgium, [373]; which is objected to by France, [374]; political reasons against such a choice, [377]
- Macauley, Mr., his speeches in favour of the Reform bill, [24], [228]
- Machine-breaking, trials for, 1, 5
- M'Caig, clergyman at Edinburgh, tried for stealing books, 80
- Mackenzie, H., author of 'Man of Feeling,' death, 219
- Magee, Dr., archbishop of Dublin, Death, 253
- Mahon, O'Gorman, his violent speech in Parliament, threatening a repeal of the Irish Union, 321
- Marriages, Scotch, case relative to, 109
- Mathison, German poet, death, 231
- Merthyr Tydvil, petition for Reform from, instanced, to show the general tenour of the demands for reform, [60]; colonel Wood's motion that the place should send a member to Parliament, [208]; riot of the miners at, 78
- Mexico, political events in, [466]
- Middiman, S., engraver, death, 260
- Military force of France, 157
- Colonies in Russia, 433
- Milton, lord, his motion for giving two members to the boroughs in schedule D, [203]
- Miners, riot of, in Cornwall, 33; at Merthyr Tydvil, 78
- Minority and majority in the lords, on the reform bill, list of, 275
- Miser, account of one, and his being robbed, 70
- Modena, conspiracy at, [451]
- Munroe, president, death, 248.



# I N D E X.

Murders: M. Lynch kills his two children, and afterwards himself, 33; murder at Bethnal Green, 51; T. Sewards murdered by M. Lundy, *ib.*; a child poisoned by its father, 53; ditto, 54; murder of C. Bunn, 55; of Sarah M'Chrinen, 56; discovery of the murder of S. Johnson, a beast-jobber committed thirty years before, 63; suspected murder of Mary Clark, 77; J. Nobbs, attempt to poison his infant, 106; T. Chisnall, shot by W. Offord, 107; R. Taylor, aged thirteen, murdered by J. A. Bell, aged fourteen, 112; Cælia Holloway, by her husband, 191; murder, committed by Bishop for the purpose of selling the bodies, 327

Musical powers, extraordinary case of, 138

Naples, earthquake in the province of Basilicata, 4

National political union, formed in London, [296]; sir F. Burdett withdraws from it, *ib.*; its doctrines as set forth in "bill of rights" published by it, *ib.*

Nelson, lady, robbery of her jewels, 78

Netherlands, see *Belgium, Holland*

Newcastle, duke of, address to, from his tenantry, and offer of their services, 165

Newspapers, attempt to evade the duty on, 74

Newton-barry, riot to prevent a sale of cattle seized for tithe, [326]; several of the police butchered by the mob, [327]

Niebuhr, German historian, death, 218

Noble, W. B., artist, death, 256

Norbury, earl of, death, 251

North, Mr., objects to the reform bill as injurious to the Protestants of Ireland, [65]

Northesk, earl of, death, 240

Nottingham, the castle burnt by the mob, [281] 161

Obituary: N. T. Carrington, 216; Bolivar, 217; rev. W. Holwell Carr, 218; Niebuhr, *ib.*; Bronevsky, 219; H. Mackenzie, *ib.*; R. P. Jodrell, 221; Delvig, 222; Izmailov, *ib.*; James Christie, 223; Dr. Trail, *ib.*; Thomas Hope, 224; R. Kreutzer, 225; captain Foster, *ib.*; rev. Dr. A. Thompson, 226; captain P. Heywood, *ib.*; sir E. Berry, 228; R. Brown, *ib.*; rev. R. Hall, *ib.*; rev. E. Davis, 229; Kozlovsky, 231; Mathisson, *ib.*; archdeacon Churton, 232; sir M. Lopes, *ib.*; Quick, comedian, 233; J. Aber-

nethy, surgeon, 235; Aug. La Fontaine, German novelist, *ib.*; duchess of Wellington, 236; T. F. Hunt, architect, 237; captain G. M. Jones, *ib.*; W. Hamper, 238; du Petit Thouars, *ib.*; R. Clutterbuck, 240; earl of Northesk, *ib.*; Jackson, portrait-painter, 241; M. Brown, ditto, 242; Mrs. Siddons, *ib.*; field-marshal Diebitsch, 244; sir Murray Maxwell, 245; archduke Constantine, 246; rev. R. Butler, *ib.*; W. Roscoe, *ib.*; president Munroe, 248; Elliston, actor, *ib.*; R. Duppa, 249; T. Greatorex, musician, 258; earl of Norbury, 251; Dr. R. Reece, 252; sir B. Hobhouse, *ib.*; P. Nasmyth, landscape-painter, 253; archbishop of Dublin (Magee), *ib.*; rt. hon. C. B. Bathurst, *ib.*; rev. S. Seyer, 254; baron O'Connell, *ib.*; general Kennedy, 255; right hon. J. Calcraft, 256; W. B. Noble, painter, *ib.*; Dr. Lyall, 257; sir W. W. Wraxall, 250; duchess dowager, Saxe-Coburg, *ib.*; sir A. Hart, 259; general Torrijos, 260; S. Middiman, engraver, *ib.*; W. Bilderdijk, Dutch Poet, 261

O'Connell, Mr., his speech on the reform bill, [66]; his intended procession of the trades at Dublin, prevented by proclamation, [304]; his subsequent stratagems to elude other proclamations against unlawful meetings, [305]; advises a run upon the banks for gold, [308]; one of his meetings dispersed by the magistrates, [310]; he does not fulfil his threat of having recourse to an action, [311]; he and several of his leading partizans apprehended, and obliged to find securities, [312]; indictments against them laid before the grand jury, [313]; true bills found, [315]; O'Connell puts in a demurrer, *ib.*; which he withdraws, and thereby pleads guilty, [316]; the affair discussed in the House of Commons, [317]; he convicts himself of having attempted a compromise with government, [318]

O'Connell, baron, death, 254

Orange, princess of, some of her stolen jewels recovered, 157

Osbaldeston, Mr., his match at Newmarket, 179

Ostrolenka, battle of, [432]

Palmerston, Lord, his speech in favour of the Reform bill, [41]

Paris, tumult at, [340]; ditto on the anniversary of the destruction of the Bastile, [349]; a new play prohibited 168



# INDEX.

Parliament, meeting of, [5]; the Reform bill introduced by Lord J. Russell, [6]; its outline [7]; Sir R. H. Inglis' speech on it, [15]; Mr. H. Twiss, [18]; Lord Althorp's defence of the bill, [20]; Mr. Hume's [21]; Mr. Baring Ward's opposition to the measure, [22]; Mr. Macaulay defends the plans of ministers, [24]; Sir C. Wetherell's speech on the bill, [27]; inveighs against it as a confiscation of charters, [29]; the attorney-general supports it, [31]; debate continued, Mr. Bankes opposes the bill, [34]; Mr. Hobhouse supports it, [35]; Mr. Baring objects to the proposed Reform, [38]; Lord Palmerston defends the bill, and imputes its present necessity to former opposition to more moderate reform, [41]; Sir R. Peel's speech, [43]; he points out the practical consequences of the bill, [46]; and the advantages of the close borough system, [47]; Mr. Duncombe deprecates the extent of Reform proposed by ministers, [50]; Mr. Stanley's speech in favour of reform, [51]; Mr. Jeffery's ditto, [54]; Mr. Croker's reply, [59]; he asserts that the petitions demand more than nominal reform, [60]; censures the proposed plan of representation as very unfair, [61]; Mr. J. T. Hope questions whether any practical benefit would arise from conceding it, [63]; share taken in the debate by other members on both sides, [64]; Mr. North points out the mischievous consequences of the bill as regards Ireland, [65]; Mr. R. Grant joins ministers in support of the bill, *ib.*; Mr. O'Connell's speech, [66]; Mr. Attwood's, [70]; he defends the present borough system, *ib.*; shows the futility of the proposed constitution, [71]; adverts to that of France, [72]; Sir James Graham's speech in support of the bill, [73]; he replies to Mr. Croker's insinuations regarding the plan of disfranchisement, *ib.*; the bill brought in, and read, [75]; effects of the parliamentary discussions, without doors, [77]; manifestations of a determination to have the bill, [80]; declaration against it by the merchants of London, [81]; motion for the second reading, [83]; Sir R. Vyvyan's speech against it, *ib.*; he contends that the abolition of tithes will be demanded, [85]; points out the similar position between a popular parliament and that of France in

1789, [86]; Mr. Sheil inveighs against the present traffic in boroughs, [87]; ridicules the idea of the bill being dangerous to the king and aristocracy, [88]; Mr. C. Grant contends that even the anti-reformers seem to admit some measure of reform to be necessary, [89]; the solicitor-general's speech in support of the bill, [90]; sir E. Sugden's against it, [91]; he charges Mr. Sheil with inconsistency in saying that it would add to the powers of the aristocracy, [92]; Mr. Pendarvis supports the bill, *ib.*; Mr. Ward opposes it, [93]; he asserts that the burdens of the people have been materially diminished, [94]; the motion for the second reading carried by a majority of *one, ib.*; ministers foresee their defeat, [95]; the bill for Ireland brought in by Mr. Stanley [96]; its outline, *ib.*; Mr. O'Connell expresses his satisfaction at it, [98]; injustice of giving additional members to Ireland and Scotland, while those of England were to be diminished, *ib.*; the increase of power given by the bill to the Catholics of Ireland, [99]; alterations made by ministers in the reform bill, *ib.*; they incline not to oppose continuing the present number of English members, [101]; alterations in the bill subsequent to the second reading, [103]; general Gascoyne's motion for the existing number of English members being preserved, [104]; seconded by Mr. Sadler, [105]; supported by sir R. Wilson, [106]; Mr. Stanley violently opposes it, *ib.*; the amendment carried against ministers, [108]; effect of the division, [109]; Lord Wharncliffe gives notice in the peers, of a motion for an address to the king not to dissolve parliament, [110]; a motion of adjournment, pending the Ordinance estimates carried against ministers, *ib.*; ministers determine on a dissolution, *ib.* tumultuous scene in the Commons, [111]; another in the house of Peers, [113]; lord Mansfield's addresses the House, *ib.*; the King's speech on proroguing parliament, preparatory to its dissolution, [114]; illuminations at the dissolution, [115]; question of privilege, occasioned by a libel in *The Times* (see *Times*), [116]; the lord Chancellor disputes the right of the House to inflict imprisonment and fine, [119]; the budget, [125] (see *Taxes*); sum-



# INDEX.

mary of the revenue for the year, [129]; violent opposition made to the proposed financial plan, *ib.*; objections to various of its details, [130]; especially to the proposed tax on transfers in the funds, [131]; which is earnestly deprecated by sir R. Peel, *ib.*; also by Mr. J. Smith, [132]; its injurious operation pointed out, [133]; the measure defended by Mr. C. Grant, &c. *ib.*; no analogy between this tax and that on the transfer of landed property, [134]; the measure abandoned by ministers, [135]; alteration in the duties on timber, *ib.*; that on Canada timber to be increased, and that on Baltic timber to be decreased, [136]; injurious effects of this on our colonies, [137]; ministers left in a minority, on the division, [140]; new arrangements relative to the civil list, [141]; Mr. Hume proposes that the allowances to the royal dukes be diminished, [145]; increase in the army, *ib.*; opposed by Mr. Hunt, who moves for a division, [147]; opening of the new parliament, [154]; the king's speech, [155]; address moved in the Lords by the duke of Norfolk, without an amendment, [156]; in the Commons by the hon. C. Pelham, [160]; Lord J. Russell moves the Reform bill, [161]; alteration regarding the 10% franchise, [162]; debate on the second reading, [163]; the case of Appleby, [166]; discussion on the general principles of the bill, [168]; sir R. Peel opposes the disfranchisement contemplated by schedule A, [172]; Mr. M'Kinnon moves for a committee to consider the population of the boroughs in both schedules, [176]; the returns of 1821 adhered to, [177]; discussion on the borough of Appleby, [179]; which is disfranchised, [183]; the borough of Downton, *ib.*; Mr. Croker contends that it ought to be preserved, [184]; ministers charged by the opposition with a departure from their own principles, [185]; its disfranchisement carried, [186]; discussion relative to St. Germain's, *ib.*; Saltash, [189]; impatience expressed by the press on the delay occasioned by these discussions, [190]; proposal of ministers that all other business should give way to the reform bill, [191]; resisted by sir R. Peel, [192]; discussions relative to boroughs in schedule B, [194]; sir R. Peel's motions for their having two members

instead of one, *ib.*; preponderancy of representation given to the northern and manufacturing part of the kingdom, *ib.*; the motion rejected, [197]; case of Chippenham, Dorchester, &c., *ib.*; discussions relative to places hitherto unrepresented, on which it is proposed to confer the franchise—Greenwich, [198]; Stoke-upon-Littleton, [203]; lord Milton's motion that the new boroughs in schedule D should have two members, *ib.*; Mr. Croker urges the inconsistency of giving a member to Gateshead, [205]; colonel Wood's amendment for giving a member to Merthyr Tydvil rejected, [208]; clause for dividing counties into districts, [209]; supported by sir R. Peel and others of the opposition, [211]; opposed by sir C. Wetherell, *ib.*; the clause carried, [212]; clause for freeholders in cities voting for counties, [213]; which is carried, [214]; marquis of Chandos's amendment that tenants-at-will of farms, at 50% rents, have votes, *ib.*; which is carried, [215]; Mr. Hunt's amendment on the 10% franchise, which is equivalent to universal suffrage, [216]; colonel Davies's amendment to prevent town freeholders voting for counties, [217]; Mr. J. Campbell's that the 10% rent be paid not oftener than quarterly, [219]; discussions relative to existing rights of franchise, [221]; sir R. Peel deprecates the forfeiture of corporate rights, [222]; clauses relative to the registration of electors, &c. [223]; observations on the labours of the committee, &c. [225]; debate on the motion for passing the bill, [226]; Mr. Macaulay vindicates its supporters from deceiving the people, [228]; points out the danger to the peers of opposing reform, [230]; Mr. Croker's reply, *ib.*; Mr. Stanley's answer to the latter, [235]; the solicitor-general for Ireland contends the crown has the power to withhold writs from decayed boroughs, should the bill be rejected, [237]; Mr. R. Grant's arguments for the necessity for reform, [239]; lord Althorp justifies the proposed reform as consistent with the principles of the constitution, [243]; sir R. Peel deprecates the contemplated change, [247]; the bill passed, [251]; carried to the Lords, [248]; debate on the second reading of the bill, [254]; Earl Grey's speech, *ib.*; lord Wharncliffe's [258]; debate resumed, [262]; lord



# I N D E X.

- the guard and driver of the London mail frozen to death, 23
- Soap manufactory, illicit seizure of, 78
- Somnambulism, case of, 76
- Spain: insurrection at Cadiz, [440]; arrests and executions at Madrid, [441]; Torrijos's unsuccessful attempt at Malaga, and execution, [442]
- Spring hymn, 454
- Stamps, sale of, after effacing writing on, 86
- Stanley, Mr., his speech in support of the reform bill, [51]; brings in the bill for altering the representation of Ireland, [96]; violently opposes general Gascoyne's motion, [106]; defends the reform bill against Mr. Croker, [235]; disavows government's having attempted to compromise with O'Connell, [317]
- Sugden, Sir E., his speech against the reform bill, [91]
- Suicide, prevented, 72; attempt at, by a gentleman at a cigar divan, 83
- Suicides: M. Lynch, murders his two children, and destroys himself, 33; Moseley, after attempting to murder a young woman, 93; two cases of suicide in Maidstone gaol, 95; J. Calcraft, M. P. 155
- Switzerland: insurrections in the canton of Basle, [420]; a federal army takes possession of the canton, [421]; insurrections in Schwyz, *ib.*; in Neuchâtel, [422]; and Berne, [423]; proceedings of the diet, *ib.*
- Tables: Public income, 262  
Public expenditure, 264  
Disposition of grants, 265  
Ways and means, 272  
Public unfunded debt, 273  
Public funded debt, 274  
Trade of the united kingdom, 276  
Navigation and vessels, 277  
Stocks, 291  
Prices of corn, hay, and butcher's meat, 292  
Bills of mortality, 293  
Bankrupts, *ib.*  
Weather, *ib.*  
Number of houses in England and Wales, rated to the house-tax, 294  
Ditto, in the metropolis, 295  
Number of persons committed, convicted, &c., *ib.*  
State of Savings' Banks, 296
- Tankerville, lord, attack upon, by the mob, at Darlington, 163
- Tariff, new Russian, 187
- Taxes, proposed reduction of, viz. on tobacco, newspapers, coal, candles, cottons, glass, auctions of landed property, [126]; those on wines to be equalized, [127]; those on timber modified, [128]; new tax on passengers by steam-boats, *ib.*; on transfers in the funds, *ib.* (See *Funds.*)
- Taylor, rev. R., trial of, for blasphemy, 93
- Tenants at will, renting land at 50*l.* per annum, admitted to vote for counties, [214]
- Tenterden, lord, attack on, 179
- Theatres: their majesties' visit to Covent Garden, 45; receipts at that theatre from 1809 to 1821, 159
- Thompson, alderman, one of the members for London, obliged to apologize to his constituents for claiming for the borough of Appleby the right of showing wherefore it should not be disfranchised, [167]
- Thomson, rev. Dr. A., death, 226
- Thorndon Hall, damage by a hurricane, 163
- Thornton, sir E., and lady, complaint against, by their son, for cruel treatment, 159
- Threatening letters, trial of Isaac Looker, and afterwards of his son, for sending, 9
- Thunderstorm, Kilmichael church damaged, 39; storm at Oxford, &c., 103
- Timber, proposed alterations in the duties on, [127], [135]
- Times, The, paragraph in, reflecting on the earl of Limerick, voted a breach of privilege, [116]; Mr. Lawson, the printer, brought to the bar of the House of Lords, [117]; he apologizes in a petition, [118]; the power of inflicting fine discussed, [119]; Mr. Lawson brought up to be reprimanded by the lord chancellor, [123]
- Tobacco, duty on, proposed to be reduced, [125]; afterwards continued, [135]
- Torrijos, failure of his insurrectionary plot at Malaga, [442]; he and his associates executed, *ib.*, and 260
- Trials: Jas. Blandford and fifteen others, machine-breaking, 1; James Warner, setting fire to a mill, 3; W. Bartlett and eleven others, machine-breaking, 5; Isaac Looker, threatening letters, 9; David Little, burglary, 14; R. Carlile, sedition, 18; Mr. St. John Long, 34; T. Clarke, murder, 40; S. Marden, stealing a tippet, *ib.*; J. Sanson, arson, 44; J. Greenwood, burglary, 48; M. Reilly and C. Courtney, conspiracy, *ib.*; M. Lundy, mur-



# I N D E X.

- der, 51; C. Giles, murder of his own infant, 53; M. Fernely, murder of his infant step-son, 54; T. and J. Fulvey, murder, 55; A. and W. Worrall, and R. Chadderton, murder, 56; Esther Dyson, deaf and dumb, murder of her infant, 59; T. Searle, attempting to kill his daughter in a fit of religious insanity, 63; Ellis, housebreaking (case of erroneous verdict), 65; rev. — M'Caig, stealing books, 79; Patrick Connors and J. Cullinane, murder of Mr. Blood, 90; rev. R. Taylor, blasphemy, 93; D. and P. Simpson, sheep-stealing, 103; W. Smith, G. Baxter, and W. Markham, burglary, 104; T. Reilly, assisting in cutting out two men's tongues, 105; J. Nobbs, attempting to poison his infant son, 106; W. Offord, murder of T. Chisnall, 107; J. A. Bell, aged 14, murder of another boy, 112; lieut. Buchanan, 122; Mary Ann Higgins, poisoning her uncle, 124; capt. Gambles, wrecking his vessel, 156; T. Wakeman and wife, and J. Lill, extensive robbery of paper, *ib.*; S. M'Lauchlan, &c., rioting at Lauder, 184; J. W. Holloway and Ann Kennett, murder of Holloway's wife, 191; Jas. Barnet, &c., riot at Dundee, 307; A. Graham, &c., riot at Haddington, 310; R. Forrester, riot at Edinburgh, 311; S. Wagh, murder of A. Ross, at Girvan, 313; Bishop, Williams, and May, murder for the purpose of selling the bodies, 316
- Union, the Irish, endeavours of the agitators to obtain its repeal, [303]
- Union, the London Political, [296], 170; proclamation against 'Political Unions,' [297]
- United States: unpopularity of the tariff, [460]; the president's message to congress 417; colonial trade, 419; foreign relations, France, 421; Spain, 422; two Sicilies, 423; indemnity promised by Portugal, for capture of vessels at Terceira, *ib.*; Austria, &c., 424; Mexico, &c., 424; removal of Indians beyond the limits of the States, 427; revenue, &c., 428; peculiar situation of Colombia, 430
- Universities, examinations, &c. at, 297
- University, new one at Durham, prospectus of, 194
- Unknown tongues, manifestation of, at the Scotch chapel, 190
- Vyvyan, sir R., his speech against the reform bill, [83]; inveighs against the eagerness on the part of ministers for a dissolution, [110]; strongly animadverts on lord J. Russell's correspondence with the Birmingham political union, [285]
- Wales: riot of the workmen at Merthyr Tydvil, 78
- Walsingham, lord and lady, the former burnt to death, the death of the other occasioned by her leaping from a window, 67
- Ward, Mr. Baring, professes himself, as a moderate reformer, opposed to the reform bill, [22], [23]
- Warsaw, the Russians approach the city, [428]; dissensions and insurrections in it, [434]; the fortifications stormed, [435]; surrender of the city [436]
- Wellesley, Mr., committed for contempt of court, by the lord chancellor, [303]; complains of it as a breach of privilege, *ib.*
- Wellington, duke of, his speech in the debate on the reform bill, [263]
- Westminster Review, its vehement tone, as the organ of one class of reformers, [22]
- Wetherell, sir C., his speech on the reform bill, [27]; on the question of franchise being bestowed on Greenwich [201]; his remarks on ministers corresponding with the Birmingham union, [287]; riot on his arrival at Bristol, 172
- Wharnccliffe, lord, gives notice of a motion for an address to the king, not to dissolve parliament, [110]; his defence of nomination boroughs, [258]; withdraws his amendment for throwing out the bill, [261]
- Winchilsea, lord, his speech against the reform bill, [262]
- Wild man, supposed one, 139
- Worcester, riot at, and attack on the bishop's palace, 177
- Wraxall, sir Nath. W., death, 258
- Yorke, sir Jas., captain Bradby, and capt. Yonge, drowned, 72
- 'Youth,' stanzas by Howitt, 456



















